This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

3 3433 06825298 4

Estate of Rev James Chrystal

April 6 '09

A

SHORT EXPLANATION

OF THE

NICENE CREED,

FOR THE USE OF PERSONS BEGINNING THE

STUDY OF THEOLOGY.

BY

A. P. FORBES, D.C.L.

BISHOP OF BRECHIN.

Quoniam misericordia Tua ante oculos meos semper:
Et complacui in veritate Tuâ.

OXFORD,

JOHN HENRY PARKER;

AND 377, STRAND, LONDON.

1852.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
492596
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.
R 1910 L

BAXTER, PRINTER, OXFORD.

TO THE

REV. J. J. HORNBY, M.A.

THE MUNIFICENT RECTOR OF WINWICK,

TO WHOM THE AUTHOR OWES

MORE THAN HE CAN ADEQUATELY ACKNOWLEDGE,

THIS IS

AFFECTIONATELY DEDICATED.

PREFACE.

Some apology is due for venturing on a subject so mysterious, and on which so many of the highest intellects have exercised themselves. It seems no small presumption to follow, at however respectful a distance, in the footsteps of Bishop Pearson. My motive for making this attempt has been to remedy a defect which has met me in my own theological reading, the want of some treatise a little more technical and systematic than the great "Exposition of the Creed." The Reformation being in some sense a reaction against previous tendencies, the theology after that did well in emancipating itself from the dry unattractive form in which it was before that presented to the reader. A dead language did not hide it more effectually than the abstract shape in which it was proposed. Accordingly,

the merit possessed by Hooker and Pearson, and claimed by Burnet[a], was to place the dogmas of religion before men without "stiffness of method," "dark terms," "the niceties of logic," or "artificial definitions," and to make the science of theology easy and pleasing. The debt which we owe to such authors cannot be exaggerated.

But amid the great revival of the last twenty years, as deeper views of God's truth have by His mercy been accorded to our aching hearts, a desire of a more systematic theology has almost of necessity been engendered. Men feel that an exact theology is at once the most reverent and the most satisfactory; the most reverent, as the nearer we get to the very Truth the better we serve Him; the most satisfactory, because a strict dogmatic theology tells us in very plain language, that after the human intellect is exhausted, it has not reached God. Men also have felt, that in an exact theology is the only sure guarantee for orthodoxy of faith. Where matters have not been defined, men have generally contented themselves with the lower view. Therefore it was that S. Athanasius was raised up by God to fight

[a] Pref. xxxix Art.

for the "consubstantial;" and we ourselves have seen how the faith of our own Church, on the subjects that were left as open questions, has shrivelled and withered away. A definite expression of doctrine embodied in the symbolic books of a Church becomes the institution by which the idea is preserved and perpetuated. Had a dogmatic teaching been then prevalent, the movement in the last century would in all probability have taken a more satisfactory direction, and the labours of the elder Wilberforce, and the other good men who then exercised so profound an influence on the pious sentiment of England, might have ended in a very different result from the Gorham decision. Nay, it is not too much to say, that the Wesleyan and Whitfield schism might have been prevented.

To supply those beginning the study of theology, then, with a work a little more technical than our present text books, has been my desire. I began by using Suicer's work on the Creed as a foundation, but have also applied to other sources both from the Latin and Greek Churches. I have suffered much from the want of books, and have in many cases been obliged to trespass on the indulgence of kind

friends to verify quotations. Of these I beg especially to express my thanks to the Reverend Chas. Marriott, B.D. Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, who at great trouble to himself has looked over the proof sheets; and also to one, to whom posterity will render that homage which those who have the honour of knowing him accord to him now, the distinguished Regius Professor of Hebrew in the same University.

And now, in presenting this little work with all its faults to the public, it is my earnest prayer that it may do good; and I can send it forth with no better aspiration than that of the great St. Augustine, "Domine Deus unus, Deus Trinitas, quæcumque dixi hîc de Tuo, agnoscant et Tui: si quæ de meo et Tu ignosce et Tui." Amen.

Dundee, Trinity Sunday,
June 6, 1852.

CONTENTS.

	Page
THE CREED OF NICÆA.	1
I. Of Faith.	13
II. Of the Unity of the Divine Essence, and the Trinity of Persons.	23
III. Of God the Father.	94
IV. Of Creation.	101
V. Of our Lord Jesus Christ.	115
VI. Of the Only-Begotten.	124
VII. Of the Generation of the Son.	130
VIII. Of the Divinity of the Son of God.	136
IX. The Son is not a Creature.	156
X. Of the term Consubstantial.	163
XI. Of the work of the Son in Creation.	168
XII. Of the Incarnation of the Son.	172
XIII. Of the Passion, Burial, and Resurrection.	211
XIV. Of the Ascension, Assession, Return, and Reign of our Lord.	236
XV. Of the Holy Spirit.	251
XVI. Of the Church.	271
XVII. Of the Remission of Sin.	294
XVIII. Of the Resurrection.	307
XIX. Of the Life of the World to come.	314
Index.	333

ERRATUM.

P. 265. note p. *for* Rich. S. Victor *read* Hugo de S. Victor.

THE

CREED OF NICÆA.

THE Creed of Nicæa, from the time of its first promulgation, has always been regarded as the bulwark of true Christianity. It has ever justly been the great test of orthodoxy on all the subjects expressed by it. It is incorporated in the daily devotional life of the Church, by being said or sung at the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, and contains the fullest revelation vouchsafed to us of the incomprehensible nature of Almighty God.

Now a Creed, so eminently authoritative in matters of faith, found throughout the Christian world in the most solemn part of its worship, when mysteries which angels desire to look into are placed within the reach of sinful men, ought surely to become the reverent study of the devout servant of his Lord; and, indeed, it becomes such an one to be very careful that

he knows all he can concerning the Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier of his soul and body; for He is a jealous God, and wills not that the evidences He gives us of His operation, or the hints He affords us of His Nature, should not be diligently studied by us. In the knowledge of God standeth our eternal life, and that knowledge is that which He has revealed to us. In the spirit of lowliness then, actuated by a sincere desire of seeing the wonderful things out of God's law, let us approach the contemplation of this sublime and precious manifestation of the Eternal Verity. And do Thou, O Everlasting Truth, Incarnate Wisdom of the Father, hear us when we call upon Thee. Prostrate in spirit at the footstool of Thy Majesty, we adore thine infinite perfections, rendering all glory, laud, and benediction to Thee. We come to Thee in search of thine Own Self, the Eternal Verity, to catch a ray from Thee, the Light of the world, to walk in Thee who art the Way, to live in Thee who art the Life. Open Thou our hearts, that we may attend to that which Thou hast revealed of Thyself, thine Everlasting Father, and thy Blessed Spirit. And as by thine Incarnation new light has come to us, lighten Thou our eyes, that we may see Thee,

and let memory, will, and understanding, bow down before thy mysteries. Domine Jesu Christe, fidei Auctor et Consummator, qui nos ad gremium sanctæ ecclesiæ, sponsæ Tuæ et matris nostræ, spretis multis millibus hominum infidelium evocasti, et ad pusillum gregem, cui complacuit Pater dare regnum cœleste, pertinere fecisti: auge in nobis scientiam et fidem a te semel infusam, et sine ulla intermissione servatam, et vitam fidei et scientiæ aptam, scilicet sanctam et Tui imitationem concede, ut aliquando tandem fidei consummationem, nempe gloriæ claritatem assequamur. Amen.

The Creed which we are about to consider comes to us on the authority of the first General Council held at Nicæa A.D. 325, in the reign of the Emperor Constantine, and Papacy of St. Silvester. Yet we do not recite it as it was there delivered, but as it was afterwards enlarged at the second General Council, held at Constantinople in the year 381, when some fresh errors, which in the mean time had sprung up, had to be condemned. In this was embodied the traditional teaching of the Church. "As we have received from the Bishops that went before us, and as we

learnt in our first instruction, and when we received baptism; also as we have learnt from the sacred Scriptures, and as we have believed and taught in the Priesthood, and in the Episcopate; so now believing, we propose this our faith to you." The chief object of the Synod in putting forth the Creed was to destroy the poison of the heresy of Arius, and to establish the orthodox faith concerning the Son of God. The Emperor, naturally desirous of the welfare of the Empire, and seeing how the agitation of this question disturbed the minds of men, convoked this Œcumenical Synod on Friday, the 19th of June, A.D. 325, when the Arian heresy was condemned, the Creed promulgated, and certain Canons, in number 20, were added.

Council of Nice.

Never since the death of the Apostles, did the Christian world behold a Synod with higher claims to be considered universal and free, or an assembly of Bishops more august and holy. For at that Council, as Eusebius says, there were assembled out of all the Churches which had filled the whole of Europe, Asia, and Africa, the very choicest from the ministers of God; and one sacred building, expanded as it were by the Divine command, embraced at once within its compass both Syrians and

Cilicians, Phœnicians and Arabians, and Christians of Palestine; Egyptians too, Thebans and Lybians, and some who came out of Mesopotamia. A Bishop also from Persia was present at the Council; and even Scythia was not wanting to that company. Pontus also and Galatia, Pamphylia and Cappadocia, with Asia and Phrygia, contributed their choicest Prelates. Moreover, Thracians, Macedonians, Achaians, and Epirotes, and inhabitants of still more remote districts, were notwithstanding their distance present. Even from Spain itself, that most celebrated man (Hosius) took his seat among the rest. The Prelate of the imperial city (of Rome, that is) was indeed absent on account of his advanced age, but Presbyters of his were present to supply his place. Constantine is the only Emperor from the beginning of the world, who, by convening this vast assemblage, an image, as it were, of the company of the Apostles, presented to Christ his Saviour a garland such as this, bound and knit together by the bond of peace, as a sacred memorial of his gratitude for the victory he had gained over his foreign and domestic enemies [a].

At this Council there were two sorts of

[a] Bull, Def. Fid. Nic.

decrees, Canons (ὅροι) and Definitions (διατυπώσεις). The first referred to discipline, the second to doctrine; so that this Creed comes under the last head. Hence in the Greek Church, Patriarchs and Bishops have to recite this symbol when they are invested with their dignity; and since the days of Timotheus, Archbishop of Constantinople, (A.D. 512,) it has been always repeated at the time of the Holy Communion, having previously to that been said only on Good-Friday, when the Bishop catechized[b]. So completely is this Creed the standard of the Church's faith, that the Emperor Justinian says, "We ordain that the holy ecclesiastical Canons shall have the force of laws, even those which have been laid down by the four holy Synods, that is, of the 318 at Nicæa, of the 150 holy Bishops at Constantinople, of the first of Ephesus, in which Nestorius was condemned, and of Chalcedon, in which Eutyches was cursed along with Nestorius. We receive the dogmas of the aforesaid holy Synods as the sacred Scriptures, and observe their Canons as laws[c]."

We said before, that the Creed as now repeated is not that of Nicæa, but that of Con-

[b] Suicer de Symb. [c] Novell. 131.

stantinople, with the well-known addition of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son. At an early time the Creed of Constantinople was called the Nicene Creed, as in fact embodying the Nicene verities. Thus the Master of the Sentences says[d], "that Creed which is sung at the Communion was put forth in the Nicene Council." So also Durandus[e]. Bona's account of these Creeds is as follows[f]: "When this Creed was recited in the same Synod (of Nicæa), we read that all the Bishops exclaimed, 'This is the faith of the Catholics; we all believe in this; into this we were baptized, into this we do baptize.'" After it was promulgated, all the Oriental Churches received it, and gave it to be learned by their faithful and their catechumens, so that he was held an Arian who did not profess it. But in the West, it was received by some Churches earlier and some later, as they became earlier or later tainted with the Arian heresy. But when new heresies arose, a second Œcumenical Synod was summoned at Constantinople, in the first session of which, a second Creed was enunciated, which Mark of

[d] Lib. i. Dist. 2.
[e] Ration. Off. Div. lib. iv.
[f] Rer. Liturg. ii. viii.

Ephesus, at the Council of Florence, said was by the common consent of the Greek Fathers attributed to S. Gregory Nazianzen. But both the Nicene and Constantinopolitan have always been held as one; and that which we now sing in the solemnities of the Liturgy, though it be that of Constantinople, is termed by the Master of the Sentences and other Schoolmen, the Nicene. The Fathers confound these, because what was added at Constantinople was virtually in the Nicene." The two Creeds are as follows:

NICÆA.

We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, the Maker of all things, visible and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of His Father, the Only-begotten, that is, of the Substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God. Begotten, not made; being of one substance with the Father, by Whom all things both in heaven and on earth were made. Who for us men and for our salvation came down, and was incarnate, and was made man; suffered and rose the third day; ascended into

the heavens; shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

And in the Holy Spirit.

And those who say that there was a time when the Son of God was not, and that before He was begotten He was not, and that He was born out of the things that exist not, or assert that He is of another nature (ὑποστάσις) or substance (οὐσία) (from the Father), or that He is mutable (τρεπτὸν), or subject to change (ἀλλοιωτὸν), the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church holdeth accursed.

CONSTANTINOPLE.

We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all things, visible and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, Begotten of the Father before all ages, Light of Light, true God of true God. Begotten, not made, consubstantial with the Father, by Whom all things were made. Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, and was made man. And was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried,

and rose on the third day according to the Scriptures. And ascended into the heavens, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father, and shall come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead, whose kingdom shall have no end:

And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the Giver of Life, Who proceedeth from the Father, Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, Who spake by the prophets:

And in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

We acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins:

We look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

Now in comparing these two symbols, we may observe, that some things in the Nicene Creed were omitted by the Fathers of Constantinople, but that several additions were made. The following omissions were made by them, thinking perhaps that the truths they asserted were in fact contained within the rest. 1. "God of God" was omitted, as contained in "true God of true God." 2. In relating the

creation, they passed over "both in heaven and on earth," as expressed by, "By Whom all things were made." 3. The explanation of the Generation of the Son, that is, "of the Substance of the Father," inasmuch as they saw that it was found in the use of the word "Consubstantial." 4. They missed out the Anathema at the end.

They added, 1. In the account of the Creation, "the Maker of heaven and earth." 2. In the Generation of the Son, "before all ages." 3. On the Incarnation, of which the Nicene Creed had simply said, "He came down," they added, "from heaven." 4. After "was Incarnate," they annexed, "by the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary." 5. In asserting the Passion, "and was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate." 6. Of His Sepulture, it was now said, "and was buried." 7. Of His Assession, that He "sitteth at the right hand of the Father." 8. Of the Judgment there is added, that His coming shall be "with glory." 9. And of His reign, that it "shall have no end." 10. The attributes and nature of the Holy Spirit are described, as "the Lord, the Life-giver, Who proceedeth from the Father, Who with the Father and Son is worshipped

and glorified, Who spake by the Prophets." 11. Of the Church it is said, "And in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church." 12. Of the Laver of regeneration, "We acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins." 13. Of the rising again and future state, "We look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen."

The Western Church uses the Creed of Constantinople, with these three differences. 1. She has restored the Nicene expression, "God of God." 2. She has rendered the expression, "was incarnate by the Holy Ghost *and* the Virgin Mary," by, "was incarnate by (de) the Holy Ghost *of* (ex) the Virgin Mary." And, 3. She has expressed the full and whole truth upon the subject, by adding to the words, "Who proceedeth from the Father," the additional words, "and the Son," which shall be discussed more at length, when we come to treat of that portion of the Creed[g].

[g] Vide Suicer de Symb. Con. Nic.

I.

OF FAITH.[a]

I BELIEVE.

Various definitions of Faith.

THE word belief, or faith, when applied to the reception of divine knowledge, means a voluntary assent of the mind to certain truths proposed to it on competent authority. "That is faith," says St. Chrysostom, "when we believe in those things which are not seen, turning the mind to the trustworthiness of Him who has announced them[b];" or, as he elsewhere says, "That is faith, when we are not contented with the bodily eyes, but when we picture to ourselves by the eyes of the soul the things that

[a] The following scheme, made out by the Schoolmen, may serve to simplify our thoughts with regard to Faith,

- Faith.
  - The Object of Faith.
  - The Act of Faith.
    - External.
    - Internal.
  - The Habit of Faith.
    - Of the virtue itself.
    - Of those who have Faith.
    - Of the cause of Faith.
    - Of the effect of Faith.

[b] Hom. 36. in Gen. p. 370.

are not seen[c]." This faith was called by the ancients DOGMATIC FAITH, being that by which we are convinced that the doctrine manifested by the word of God is true. St. John Damas. says, "Faith is twofold. For faith cometh by hearing. Hearing the divine Scriptures, we believe the teaching of the Holy Spirit, and it (faith) is perfected in all things that are commanded by Christ, by our believing indeed, and acting religiously, and keeping the commandments of Him who hath renewed us. For he who believes according to the tradition of the Church, yet communicates in the works of the devil, is an infidel. There is moreover a faith which is 'the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen,' the indubitable and indisputable hope of those things which are promised us by God, and of the obtaining our petitions." "Not in the practice of virtue, and in the observance of the commandments only, but also in the narrow path of faith, is the way steep and narrow that leadeth unto life[d]?"

To believe is to think assentingly, without vacillation and without actual sight[e].

[c] Hom. 63. in Gen. p. 607. [d] S. John Damas. Orth. Fid. iv. 11. [e] Serm. 5. Nativ. S. Leo. [f] S. Thos. ii. 2. c. 1.

Faith is the first of the theological virtues in the order of time, but not in the order of importance, because it belongs to the intellect, whose action precedes that of the will, and because it is the foundation of the rest of the virtues, and the gate of spiritual good; for we must believe in God, before we can love Him, and obey His commandments. It hath justly attributed to it four results—meditation, contemplation, contempt of the world, and purity of heart. For whoso believeth, seeketh the knowledge of the things believed, and this desire of knowledge instigateth a search, which is meditation. But pious search findeth the truth, and resteth therein with joy, which is contemplation. Then truth, when found, teacheth how worthless the world is, and generateth a dislike for it, which dislike of the world tendeth to that adhesion, whereby we cling to God, in which consisteth purity of earth[f].

Justifying faith (to speak accurately and theologically) is nothing else than a pious and sure assent of the mind, produced by the Holy Ghost from the word, by which we acknowledge all things revealed by God in the Scriptures, and especially those concerning the redemption

[f] Alvarez de Exterm. Mal. p. 655.

and salvation wrought by Christ, to be most true by reason of the authority of God, who has revealed them[g]. Therefore, considered in itself and in its essence, it is nothing else than catholic (dogmatic) faith, which itself doubtless justifies a man, if all other things which are necessary to justification accompany it[h].

Faith signifies not so much the act of thinking or opining, as it has the sense of a firm obligation, (contracted in virtue of a free act of submission,) whereby the mind decisively, and permanently, assents to the mysteries revealed by God[i].

It is the reunion with God in Christ, especially by means of the faculties of knowledge, illuminated and confirmed by grace, with which the excitement of various feelings is more or less connected. It is a divine light, whereby man discerns, as well as recognises, the decrees of God, and comprehends not only what God is to man, but what man should be to God[k].

From these various definitions we see, that the word faith may be taken in several senses: and this is evident from the Holy Scripture.

1. Sometimes it is taken for fidelity in pro-

[g] Forbesii Consid. Mod. p. 17. [h] Ibid. [i] Cat. Rom. [k] Möhler.

mising, as, "Shall then unbelief make the faith of God without effect[l]?"

2. It is taken for the promises themselves, as "having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith[m]."

3. It means sometimes conscience, as, "whatsoever is not of faith is sin[n]."

4. It is used for confidence, as, "but let him ask in faith, nothing wavering[o]."

5. It is used for the Christian religion, as, "fight the good fight of faith[p]."

6. Lastly, it is taken for the assent of the intellect, or the habit that inclines us to assent on the authority of another; if the authority be human, it is human faith: if it be divine, it is divine or theological faith: and this last, as regards the truths taught by the Church, is termed Catholic Faith.

Divine faith then is theologically defined to be a gift of God, and a light, illuminated by which, men firmly assent to all things which God has revealed, and which He proposes to them by His Church to be believed, whether written or unwritten. Definition of divine faith.

It is termed 'a gift' of God, because it is

[l] Rom. iii. 3. [m] 1 Tim. v. 12. [n] Rom. xiv. 23.
[o] James i. 6. [p] 1 Tim. vi. 12.

freely given by God alone, and surpasses all the natural powers. It is essentially supernatural. It is termed a 'light,' because spiritually the intellect is raised and enlightened so as to know and believe those things that are of faith. The assent of the intellect must be "firm," without any hesitation or fear of the consequences, for it rests upon the veracity of God Himself. "The Church" being, as St. Paul says, the pillar and ground of the truth, and having authority in controversies of faith, is that which is the motive of our faith, inasmuch as it belongs to it to declare what is the object of our belief.

Now the power of the soul in which faith resides has been said to be the intellect, but it is also connected with the will; for being, according to the words of the Apostle, "the evidence of things not seen," it does not rest upon the intellect alone, but requires certain pious affections and submissions of the will towards the Supreme Truth; as the same Apostle says, "By whom we have received grace and apostleship, for obedience to the faith." Hence the virtue is not only speculative, but also practical, "working by love," causing to subdue kingdoms, to work righteous-

ness, to obtain promises; for "faith without works is dead[q]."

Divisions of faith.

Now faith has been variously divided by theologians. It has been divided into habitual and actual; into explicit and implicit; into internal and external; into formed or living, and unformed or dead.

Actual faith, is a firm and certain, though not evident, assent to the things which are revealed by God. In that it is firm and certain, it differs from opinion, and exceeds it. For the subject of opinion may, and often is, false, and the assent to it is weak and uncertain; there is in it a fear and a hesitation with regard to things opined of. In that faith is a not-evident assent, both understanding, knowledge, and wisdom exceed it, in that they are intellectual virtues, possessing clearness and sight.

Habitual faith is a certain intellectual habit, whereby the intellect is inclined to actual faith[p].

Explicit faith, is that by which we assent to any doctrine which with its terms is known to us.

Implicit faith, is that by which certain truths are believed, not as recognised in themselves, but as contained in some other great

[p] Vega de Justif. p. 717. [q] James ii. 20.

verity. This is the case of many ignorant Christians.

Internal faith, is the assent in the mind.

External faith, is that inward assent evidenced by some sign or outward profession.

Formed or living faith, is that which is informed by charity, which is the form and perfection of all other virtues. It is faith working by love.

Informed or dead faith, is the mere assent of the mind without love, like the devils' belief in God.

Object of faith.

The material object of faith, or 'what' we are to believe, is twofold. Under this come all those things which God has revealed to us. He Himself and His attributes are the primary and principal objects, while the Humanity of Christ, the Sacraments, and all other things necessary to salvation, are the secondary ones. St. Thomas thus explains it[r]; "The object of faith is the first truth, as it is manifested to us in the Scripture, and in the teaching of the Church."

The formal object of faith, or "why" we should believe these things, is the supreme veracity of Almighty God, Who of His infinite wisdom cannot be deceived, and of His infinite

[r] II. ii. 5. 3.

goodness and perfection cannot deceive. What we believe we receive as the voice of God Himself, according to the words of the Apostle; "For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh in you that believe[a]."

Motives of faith.

The motives of faith are external and internal. The external motives are the authority of the Church, the miracles performed by our Lord and the disciples, the harmony of the divine dispensations, the oracles of the Prophets, the antiquity and universality of the faith, the sanctity and purity of its doctrine, the constancy of those martyrs who have died for it, the attestation of enemies, the conversion of the world, and the wondrous power of faith in converting the soul. The inward motives of faith are twofold. The natural *light of the understanding*, which so far accepts of the articles of faith as true, when calmly and dispassionately viewed, as to prepare for the other inward motive, the *light of faith*, which is the supernatural, internal instinct by which the intellect is inclined

[a] 1 Thess. xi. 13.

to accept of the truths proposed to it. This is the *habitual light of faith.* The *actual light of faith* is such an inward illumination in grace as God communicated to Lydia, to attend to the things that were said of Paul[t].

Of articles of faith.

An article of faith is a proposition or primary truth among things to be believed, having its own difficulty of acceptance, and being necessary to everlasting salvation. These articles thrown together constitute the Symbol or Creed.

[t] Acts xvi. 14.

II.

OF THE UNITY OF THE DIVINE ESSENCE, AND THE TRINITY OF PERSONS[a].

I BELIEVE IN ONE GOD.

THE Bishops of Nicæa confess that they believe in One God, yet they make mention of

[a] As an exact terminology is most important in theology, I have thought right to put down the Latin definitions of the various words used in speaking of the Adorable Trinity.

Essentia, quæ ab *esse* dicitur, est id quo res quælibet in suo esse constituitur, seu est id quod est. Sic essentia hominis est id per quod homo est; nihil ea prius excogitari in qualibet re potest. Tria in eam concurrunt, 1°, ut sit quod primum in ente concipitur. 2°, ut cæterorum quæ in eodem sunt, aut ab eo dimanant, radix sit ac fundamentum. 3°, ut id sit, quo ab alia re qualibet distinguatur. Sic essentia hominis est ut sit animal rationale.

Natura. 1°, exprimit id quod ex alio ortum habuit; 2°, synonyma est essentiæ—ut autem ab ea distinguatur, natura definiri solet Principium actionis divinæ ab ipsa tamen actione interiori minime sejunctum.

Substantia est id quod nullo alio indiget, cui inhæreat ad existendum. Triplici autem sensu accipitur; 1°, pro essentiâ; 2°, pro eo quod accidentibus subest; 3°, pro re per se existente, quâ postremâ significatione tam de Deo quam de creaturis enunciari potest.

three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. When they name the One, they assert the unity of Substance; when they mention the Three, they mean a Trinity of Persons.

By the word God, we mean a Being, than which nothing better can be or be conceived. Although, properly speaking, the existence of God is the object of faith, yet this truth also commends itself to the enlightened reason of man.

Existentia definiri potest essentia in actu.

Subsistentia sumitur pro modo quo substantia quædam singularis tota et ultimo completa subsistit, suique juris efficitur.

Suppositum, 'idem est ac subsistentia sed in concreto existens:'—seu, 'substantia ultimo completa, suique juris,' seu substantia cum modo suo.

Persona, 'idem est ac suppositum sed ratione præditum,' seu 'rationalis naturæ individua substantia.'

Origo, est emanatio unius ab alio.

Principium est id quod rationem continet cur illud sit cujus dicitur principium quodque principiatum vocatur.

Causa, dicitur principium influens esse in aliud, seu, causa generatim sumpta est id quo rationem continet cur aliquo modo habeatur aliud natura distinctum.

Generatio, est origo viventis a principio vivente conjuncto in similitudinem naturæ.

Processio, est origo unius ab alio.

Relatio, est ordo seu habitudo unius ad alterum.

Notio, est id quo valemus alteram ab alterâ personâ secernere et internoscere.

For instance: the world and every thing that is in the world is finite, mutable, and can give no reason for its existence in itself or from itself. Again, this universe consists of parts, and that which is made up of parts cannot be infinite, else it would at once be finite and infinite, or the infinite would be made up of finite parts. So every one must admit that this universe is subject to change, and hence creation is not necessary, but contingent; it need be, or it need not be. It were no absurdity to conceive of the world and its parts as not existing. From this it follows, that that which is finite and mutable, and which has not the reason of its being in itself, which indifferently may be or not be, must be determined as to being by some other, and must have the reason and cause of its existence from some other; for if not, then an effect might be without a cause, and "being" might be joined with "not being," which were contradictory. But the Being which holds within Himself the supreme reason of the existence of things contingent, and is the cause of these, must have His existence outside of these and is "simply necessary." For if He were contingent, the same argument would demand a cause above Him, and so on ad infinitum.

Metaphysical argument for the existence of God.

There exists therefore a Being "simply necessary," absolutely unproduced, deriving His Being from Himself, containing the cause of His existence in Himself, by the very power and necessity of His nature determined to be, personal, and eternal. And this Being or Cause of all things, supreme, necessary, unproduced, and eternal, we call GOD[b].

Natural-theological argument.

The order of nature, with the disposition of each thing in its proper place, and its fitness for its proper ends, involves the idea of some One who orders it: and the more perfect that order is, and the greater simplicity it exhibits in its multiplicity, the wiser must that One be. The more that men contemplate and study the universe, and ascertain the laws whereby the physical world is governed:—the more they compare the relations each thing has with others and with the universe:—the more that wonderful order is recognised, which results from the correspondence of the parts, the proportion of means to their ends, from the simplicity and stedfastness of the laws of nature, from the subordination of final causes, and from the universal harmony of creation:—the more that

[b] See Aug. De Civit. Dei, lib. viii. Damas. De Orth. Fid. lib. i. c. 3.

all this is considered, the more will the wisdom of Him who ordains it shine forth. The supremely wise and powerful Being, who moreover is seen to be supremely good and benevolent, that we call God. All nature testifies to the being of a God.

"O all ye works of the Lord, bless ye the Lord, praise Him and magnify Him for ever." "It is the Lord that commandeth the waters, it is the glorious God that maketh the thunder. It is the Lord that ruleth the sea. The voice of the Lord is mighty in operation[c]." "For He spake and it was done, He commanded and it was created[d]." "Thou shalt shew us wonderful things in thy righteousness, O God of our salvation; Thou that art the hope of all the ends of the earth, and of them that remain in the broad sea. Who by His strength setteth fast the mountains, and is girded about with power. Who stilleth the raging of the sea, and the noise of the waves, and the madness of the people. . . . Thou visitest the earth, and blessest it, making it very plenteous[e]." "O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast Thou made them all: the earth is full of thy riches. So is the great and wide sea also,

[c] Ps. xxix. 3, 4. [d] Ps. cxlviii. 5. [e] Ps. lxv. 5—9.

wherein are things creeping innumerable, both small and great beasts[f]." "Let them praise the Name of the Lord, for He spake the word, and they were made; He commanded, and they were created[g]."

Moral argument for the existence of God.

All mankind in every age have commonly consented in the belief of some God. Now there must be some cause for this common consent, which is at once universal and every where, and that cause cannot be found, save in an original primæval tradition, or in the dictates of the intelligent nature of man, or in a combination of both of these[h].

And every man who really reflects will find each of these arguments may be drawn from himself. For unless he acknowledge God to be the first cause of his own being, he can give no reason for his existence; and when he comes to consider how the Divine Wisdom shines forth in his own organization, both physical and moral, and in addition to this, listens to the inward voice within him, which loudly proclaims the existence of the Deity; he must acknowledge that there is a Supreme Being, the Cause of all things, most wise and

[f] Ps. civ. 24. [g] Ps. cxlviii. 5.
[h] See Cicero de Nat. Deorum, lib. i. c. 16.

beneficent, appealing to the very inmost depths of His nature.

The unity of God.

Now even by the use of our reason, we must perceive that the very idea of God implies that He is one. We understand by God something that is supreme. Now there cannot be two beings supreme, because they must come into collision with each other, or, at least, no one can be called supreme if another be equal to Him. Tertullian says[1], "Since God is supremely great, rightly our truth declares, that "if God is not *one*, He is not. Not as if we doubted, in saying so, whether He is; but because, well assured that He is, we define Him to be that which if He were not, He were not God. For if He be not supremely great, He is not God. But that which is supremely great must be one. Therefore God will not be God otherwise than as the supremely great; nor will He be supremely great, but as having no equal. Nor will He be as having no equal, unless He be one."

St. Thomas draws three arguments for the unity of God: 1. From His simple and undivided nature. 2. From the infinity of His perfections; that infinity implying incommunicability. And, 3. From the unity of the

[1] Adv. Marcion, lib. i. c. 3.

world, which evidently suggests one ordaining will.

And if natural religion tells us, that from the very necessity of the case there must be one God, Revelation confirms the same. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord[k]." "I am the Lord; that is my name, and my glory will I not give to another[l]." "And this is life eternal, to know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent[m]." "We know that an idol is nothing in the world, and there is none other God but one. For though there be that are called Gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be Gods many and Lords many,) but to us there is but one God, the Father, of Whom are all things, and we in Him: and one Lord Jesus Christ, by Whom are all things, and we by Him[n]." "Have we not all one Father, hath not one God created us[o]?" "Did not one fashion us in the womb[p]." "One Lord, one faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all[q]."

[k] Deut. vi. 4. Mark xi. 29. [l] Is. xlii. 8. [m] John xvii. 3. [n] 1 Cor. viii. 4—6. [o] Mal. ii. 10. [p] Job xxxi. 15. [q] Eph. iv. 5, 6.

Yet natural as this truth seems, we find it corrupted in many ways; for the belief in one God is the peculiarity of the true religion, and of those false ones which have corrupted or borrowed from it.

Polytheism, or Heathenism.

I. There are the numberless Gods of the Heathen, in which, as the patriarchal tradition of the true God became obscured by the sin and ignorance of men, deified heroes, and abstractions of the passions and virtues, and the powers of nature, and the host of heaven, and noxious animals, came to be adored. And in spite of the horror with which we now, by the grace of God, look upon the idolatries of the earth, very winning were those ancient superstitions. For, first of all, there was enough of the true faith remaining in them to elevate the aspiring part of man. Somewhat of the attributes of the true God might still be seen in the base copies of the poet or hierophant, and so beauteous is the face of God, that even His counterfeit was amiable. And then there was much that spoke to a lower part of man's nature; not to mention his fears propitiated by the worship of the infernal deities, the furies, and the symbolic serpent, his admiration of the great and good was gratified by the devotion to

the demigods, as by the worship of the virtues. And then the beauteous voice of nature, which ever speaks so sweetly to the heart of man, to the old heathen had another and more mysterious significance. Every mountain had its Oreads, every forest its Dryads, every sea and lake its Nereids and Naiads. The mystic Pan and his attendant nymphs peopled the leafy solitudes, Diana and her huntresses gladdened the echoing mountains with their horns, Ceres shone over the yellowing fields of the husbandman, while the tower-crowned mother of the gods at once blessed and typified the civilization of the earth. And then the passions of man's nature, active and craving, demanded the benediction of some religion, and so religion shaped itself to the depraved heart of man, and Aphrodite, and Eros, and the Graces, rose to sanctify indulgence, and to quench the small remains of the quickly silenced conscience. Nor was this all; if disgusted with the fruits of a worship, which, however lovely in its poetry, was hideous and debasing in its practice, the wildered heathen sought a purer faith, that was supplied him in the rites of Mithra, and "in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." Solemn Osiris,

[r] Greg. Naz. Orat. 39. p. 678.

calm Serapis, gentle beneficent Isis, though even this degenerated into the Isaicæ sacraria lenæ, and in earlier times, the different Mysteries symbolizing and preserving the remains of patriarchal truth held out their lures for his aching heart, and in the excitement of the secret and in the indulgence of the imaginative, he was taught to forget the true. And all this clothed in the beauteous forms of the perfection of human art, sculpture, painting, architecture, joining to minister to it! Who, when he thinks of this, can fail to recognise the supernatural mission of that Christianity, which overthrew this mighty structure, or to venerate that Cross which has been planted upon its ruins!

II. There arose from a deeper philosophy, from the consideration of the conflict of good and evil, which forms a trial to the faith even of the enlightened and humble Christian, a belief in two principles. Man could not fail to see goodness, and mercy, and truth, and beauty in creation, nor had he entirely forgotten what his fathers had told him of the true God; but he also saw struggling with good, and often overpowering it, that mysterious element of evil, which the Catholic Christian, enlightened by the Spirit, and overcome Dualism.

by a sense of his own feebleness of intellect, traces up to the Fall, and leaves there. To solve the difficulty, he therefore betook himself to the theory of DUALISM, that there exist a good and an evil Principle, struggling with each other. This was the faith of the Manichees, but it seems far older than Manes, for Ormuzd and Ahriman, the good and the evil principle, have been adored and propitiated in the eastern lands from a very early time. As the Church extended eastward, we find that she soon came into collision with this theory, which, modified and altered by circumstances, formed a fruitful source of heresy within her. Of this nature was the error of Cerdon and his followers, of whom St. Epiphanius[8] tells us, that they said "there were two Gods, one good and unknown by any, whom they called the Father of Jesus, and one the Creator, who was bad and known, who spoke in the Law and appeared in the Prophets, and was often seen." Of this nature seem also to have been the heresies of Marcion, Valentinus, Marcus, and Basilides. Against all these theories, which now exist not formally, though a subtler error infests the world, we may quote the

Hæres. vol. i. p. 300.

words of Theodoret. "Both the Old and the New Testament teach us, that there is one Principle of all things, the God of all, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, unbegotten, indestructible, eternal, infinite, incomprehensible, interminate, uncompounded, without body, invisible, simple, good, just, intelligent, light, power commensurate only with the Divine will." 'Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen: that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am He; before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I even I am the Lord, and beside me there is no Saviour[t].' 'Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts; I am the first, and I am the last: and beside me there is no God[u].'"

It is difficult to find out the exact doctrine of these ancient dualists. They were not always consistent. Some seem to have held two absolute principles, one of good and one of evil, independent of each other, and unproduced: others seem to have maintained that the evil principle was made by God, and so admitted the unity of God. In either case, the difficulties

[t] Is. xliii. 10, 11. [u] Is. xliv. 6.

are greater than in the true belief; for the first implies the contradiction that there may exist two supreme Beings, which is absurd: and that there is a supreme Being crowned with every perfection, except good only. Besides, it in fact destroys the idea of moral evil, which depends upon freedom of the will. The second theory is inconsistent, because the supposition that evil is created by God, takes away from its being a first principle, which the theory of dualism requires, and in fact it only comes to be a heretical way of stating a truth.

But the real difficulty of dualism is, that it actually is inadequate to account for the origin of evil, which has been the cause of its existence. This applies both to the case of moral and of physical evil. For physical evils are not always absolutely evils, but only relatively; that is, what is evil to one is good to another. Besides, evil may have the same immediate and proximate cause which good may have. For as the science of natural history teaches us, that from the same law and the same cause, phenomena apparently contradictory may be exhibited; so the same causes may produce either good or evil, pleasure or pain. The same heat which contributes to vegetable and

animal life, produces many results which may destroy or injure it.

In the case of moral evil, it must be remembered, that this originates from a nature intelligent, finite, and free. But a limitation of the intelligence in every degree, and consequently the possibility of deception on the part of the free will, of necessity belongs to the creature. Also the moral law and rule of practice is not subjective but objective to the free and intelligent creature, wherefore it seu creatura may come short in that law. And since these things are so, it is evident that we cannot apply to any principle in itself bad, to expound the origin of moral evil. In fact, the question comes back to this, (1) whether God could make a free and intelligent creature or not, and (2) whether He could or can permit any moral defect, or is bound to prevent it: both which propositions right reason affirms.

Belief in Æons or Gnosticism.

III. A further strange perversion of this truth was found in another phase of the same oriental philosophy, which gave rise to dualism. It was the belief in Æons[x]. This was taught by Valentinus and his school[y], by

[x] See Epiph. Hæres. ii. p. 164. Aug. de Hæres. t. viii. p. 7.

[y] Milman, Hist. Christianity, p. 208.

Saturninus, Bardesanes, and Basilides. All these teachers, though differing in details, may be classed under the head of Gnostics. It is true that they all maintained the existence of the Primal Deity remaining aloof in His Majesty, the unspeakable, ineffable, nameless, and self-existent[z]. The Pleroma or fulness of the Godhead extended itself in still outspreading circles, and approached till it comprehended the universe. From the Pleroma emanated all spiritual being to be again reabsorbed in it. But from the Primal Deity proceeded seven beings, constituting the first scale of intellectual beings, and inhabiting the highest heaven, mind, reason, intelligence, wisdom, power, justice, and peace. What we call attributes, the Gnostics made deities.

Valentinus increased the number of Æons to thirty, dwelling alone within the sacred and invisible circle of the Pleroma; they were all in one sense manifestations of the Deity, all purely intellectual. Buthos and Mixis, Ageratos and Henosis, Autophyes and Hedone, are samples of the male and female Æons of this wild writer. Drawing from the imagination as well as from the luxuriant supplies of

[z] Corresponding with Bram of the Orientals.

oriental philosophy, the Gnostics varied very much, and spread out into infinitely diversified subdivisions; and their poetic fancies revelled in the creation of new systems, but all maintained two dogmas common to all their variations—the incomprehensible nature of the Supreme Being, and the malignity of matter as opposed to spirit.

The monarchy in God.

Now the Fathers of the Church had strongly to insist upon the Unity of God. The aspect of Christianity from without seemed to give colour to a suspicion, that its votaries believed in a plurality of deities. When the heathen heard the Christians insisting on the divinity of Christ and of the Holy Ghost, it was natural they should suppose that in their system the Father was one God, and Christ another God, and the Holy Spirit a third God. It was therefore manifestly their duty to teach the (μοναρχία) Monarchy; that is, the Single Principle. It was their duty to shew, that while in God there are three Persons, and each of these three Persons by Himself is God and Lord, so there is only one God, one Deity embracing the three, one Deity, in which the Father, the Fountain of the Godhead, begot the Son, while from the Father and the Son the Holy Spirit proceeds. To teach this more

clearly, they insisted very strongly on the other description which God has given us of His Son, viz. that He is His Word, His Reason, and His Image, shewing thereby that the One is inseparable from the Other, and that the One cannot be thought of apart from the Other, or as two identities and not one. And so with regard to the Holy Spirit. Thus St. Chrysostom explaining the passage, as, "The *Lord* grant that he may find mercy from the *Lord* in that day," says, "Are there two Lords? By no means. To us there is one Lord Jesus Christ, and one God. Those who are afflicted with the disease of Marcion insult this saying. But let them learn, that there is authority for this in Scripture, and that frequently this form of language is used; as where it is said, "The Lord said unto my Lord;" or again, "The Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven." Which passages shew, that the Persons are of one substance, not that the natures are different. For he says this, that we must understand not two substances differing from each other, but two persons each of one and the same substance [a]."

Difficulties with regard to the unity of God.

Now to the doctrine of the unity of God,

[a] Chrys. Hom. iii. in 2 Tim.

various difficulties have been raised. Some have inferred, from the use of the plural Elohim in the first chapter of Genesis, that Monotheism was an idea recently introduced, and taught to root out Polytheism: that in Asia, and even among the Hebrews, this misbelief was general: that at best the latter worshipped a local God, the God of Israel: that passages in the Bible, like, "Let us make man;" and, "has become like one of us," suggest the idea of Polytheism: that our Lord uses the expression, "I said, ye are Gods," and likens Himself to such Gods: and lastly, that the Apostle speaks of Gods many and Lords many[a].

Now to obviate these difficulties, one must say, in the first place, that Moses has elsewhere determined the use of the word Elohim[b], as applied to the one God: that it is a mistake to say Polytheism existed before Monotheism, because Genesis being confessedly the oldest record we have, we there read of the worship of the One God, the Creator of heaven and earth, to whom Cain, Abel, and Noah, offered sacrifice. So also in Egypt, in the case of Pharaoh; in Canaan, in the cases of Abimelech, king of Gerar, and Melchisedek, king of Salem, we

[a] 1 Cor. viii. 3. [b] Deut. xxxii. 17. [c] Gen. xii.

find a Monotheism afterwards supplanted by Polytheism. Then as to the use of the plural, as, "Let us make man," this expression was even by the Cabbalists confined and applied to the different persons in the Deity: nor can they be understood otherwise; for Moses, the teacher of a Monotheistic faith, would not have used ambiguous phrases. Our Lord's was only an *argumentum ad hominem*, shewing from the use of the word in the Old Testament, that to apply the word God to Himself, did not necessarily imply blasphemy, when that term was given to judges and great men. Lastly, St. Paul is merely using popular language, which would be understood by people living where heathenism was the religion of the empire.

We have arrived then at the definition of God, as a Being than whom nothing can be or be thought of better; and we have seen, that from His very nature He must be one. It remains for us, before considering the next clause in the Creed, to dwell in reverence upon some of His attributes.

Attributes of God.

The attributes of God are severally divided by theologians either into *absolute* and *relative*, the first belonging to the Divine Nature, the second to the Divine Persons; or into *negative*

and *affirmative*. The first being those which, though actually positive, are expressed by words formed by a negative, as immensity, (the *not* being measurable,) immutability, (the *not* being liable to change,) &c. the latter being those which are expressed by affirmative words, such as goodness, justice, &c. To dwell upon all these attributes, is rather the duty of the saint in his chamber; it is more profitable for us to consider some of those concerning which doubts have been suggested, or controversy arisen.

The simple and uncompounded nature of God.

The first attribute which we must consider is what is termed in Latin, Simplicitas Dei; the fact that He is of a simple and uncompounded essence. This truth was anciently impugned by the Anthropomorphites, and all idolaters, and is now denied by the new sect of the Mormonites, and by the Pantheists, who hold that God is the universe which we see. These opinions are all contrary to the words of Christ Himself, who tells us, that "God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth[d]." Also to the words of the Apostle, "The Lord is that Spirit[e]:" to which may be added all those many texts which attribute to God properties incompatible with

[d] John iv. 24. [e] 2 Cor. iii. 17.

physical composition; such as infinity, immensity, eternity. But not only do these attributes attest the truth of this doctrine, His very nature does so also: for naturally "God is what He has;" and being a Being than which nothing better can be conceived, He is evidently not subject to composition, which implies imperfection; and, lastly, the fact that He is self-subsistent, and draws His being from Himself, implies the same truth.

Mormonite materialism.

Were it not for the existence of Mormonism, it would be hardly necessary to treat this matter at all. The following extract from the Latter Day Saints' Catechism, or Child's Ladder, by Elder David Moffat, explains their ideas. "28. What is God? He is a material, intelligent Personage, possessing both body and parts. —29. Could He be a Being without body or parts? No, verily, no.—30. What form is He of? He is in the form of man, or rather man is in the form of God?—Where do you find these proofs? In the Old and New Testament.—Can you prove then that man is in the form of God? Yes: Gen. v. 1. 'In the likeness of God created He him.'—Can you mention the parts of His Body from Scripture? Exod. xxxiii. 22, 23. Exod. xxiv. 10.—As the God

of Heaven possesses parts, doth He also possess powers? Yes, He eats, He drinks, He loves, He hates. Gen. xviii. 5. Mal. i. 2. Amos vi. 8.—Can this Being, God, occupy two places at once? No.—Can He move from planet to planet with facility and ease? Yes. Gen. xi. 5." Now with regard to these texts, we must remember, in the first place, that the likeness to God in which man was created was a likeness in the soul; for as God exists in a Trinity of Persons, so the soul exists in a trinity of powers, memory, will, and understanding. And then it must be recollected, that the human parts and passions attributed to God in the Bible are to be taken metaphorically and not literally, otherwise they would contradict other texts; such as, "Do I not fill heaven and earth[f]?" or, "The Spirit of God hath filled the world[g]." Nay more, they would contradict the existence of those attributes which are inseparable from the notion of God, immensity, infinity, &c. which notions moreover seem to explain to us in what sense the word Spirit (in itself doubtful) must be used with reference to the Supreme.

Pantheism, the essence of which consists in admitting but one substance, arose from a mis- Pantheistic materialism.

[f] Jerem. xxiii. 24. [g] Wisd. i. 7.

understanding of the dogma of creation—that God made all this universe out of nothing. It prevailed extensively in the schools of the Greek philosophy, and is the cardinal point of the Vedanta and other Indian metaphysics. Deeply infecting human nature, it lurked for many ages unnoticed, till the great Jew of Amsterdam, Spinoza, restored it to the rank of philosophical methods, and now it prevails extensively in Germany, and in one phase forms the basis of all those theories of the perfectibility and progress of man which have affected the politics of France. In fact, it is the natural solution of the Question of Being, at which the reason of man, unenlightened by any revelation, arrives.

Now the fundamental error of this system is, that it identifies the finite with the infinite, classes limited with absolute intelligence, makes God the same as the world, and, as we said before, believes in the existence of one substance. This theory has been divided into rationalistic, spiritualistic, historical and mystic Pantheism; or, by another division, into emanatistic, idealistic, and realistic.

Rationalistic Pantheism, the theory of Fichte and Schelling, proceeds from rational principles

à priori, and transfers itself by immediate and concrete intellectual intuition into the real absolute Esse of all beings, whether nature or spirit, ego or non-ego, subject or object, pure thought or pure being. On this is founded the theory of identity, nature being supposed to be the foundation of the existence of God, and that that in God is consubstantial with Spirit, although it be different from it in the form and external manifestation.

Spiritualistic Pantheism, introduced by Hegel, has still many followers. He sought in God Spirit only, and looked upon God as a Being which is evolved, and which in the different steps of its evolution constitutes diverse and successive orders of existences or beings. Logically, God is first thought of in Himself, in the eternity of His fundamental essence; but since He cannot continue in that state, it is necessary that He should evolve Himself out of Himself in the external multiplicity of the things of nature. He is the philosophy of nature. But then He cannot continue in this state of exteriority and transition; by the necessity of His being, He must recover Himself from the multiplicity into the unity of His essence, and Spirit be produced. Hence arises the philo-

sophy of spirit. In the end, the absolute Being acquires knowledge or consciousness of Himself, and becomes an infinite Personality. From this triple state arises the logical continual Trinity of Hegel, a system which implies that God would be incomplete without man and the world.

Historical Pantheism springs necessarily from the above. For if God, in the continual evolution of Himself, of necessity manifests Himself in the world and in humanity, it follows, that all things which happen not only in the world but in man, are so many necessary evolutions of God, whether truth or errors, virtues or vices. Hence every epoch and doctrine is evolved by a necessary law, and hence the theories of indefinite progress and the infinite perfectibility of man.

Mystic Pantheism is that by which the mind, as by a vague sentiment, immediately apprehends that its life is consubstantial with God, who, as infinite love, manifests Himself in Spirit and in nature. This is the opinion of the Saintsimonians.

It will easily be seen, that all these systems are not only contrary to that truth which we have been considering, the simple and uncom-

pounded nature of God, but also are hostile to the very essence of the Christian faith, inasmuch as they all destroy the very nature of God, by identifying it with man and the universe; they require à priori an evolution of God into man and the universe, which cannot be proved: and lastly, they imply that Christianity itself is only a passing manifestation of God, to give place to a further and better one.

As the whole system of Pantheism rests in the thought of unity of substance, by the confusion of the idea of absolute substance with that of relative, finite, and contingent substance, which might be, and actually is, produced out of nothing, it follows, that to overthrow Pantheism, in whatever shape it appear, it is sufficient to prove the double existence of substance.

Now they who establish an absolute infinite substance, whether real or ideal, do so from arguments à priori; but we neither know nor can know the existence of any substance except à posteriori, that is, from experience, either mediately or immediately; but the same experience tells us, that there must be granted existences, finite, circumscribed, mutable, active, and passive, in one word, contingent,

which, since they can give no account of their being in themselves, lead us to admit an absolute necessary infinite free substance; in other words, God, a divine substance, manifestly differing from contingent ones. And if, as the Pantheists do, we join the finite with the infinite substance, the necessary with the contingent, we at once get into many difficulties. We have a nature at once necessary and contingent: at once finite and infinite: at once simple and compounded: at once capable and incapable of change. We also have to infer, that an absolute and infinite substance must of necessity exclude the existence of any finite existence distinct from itself; that an infinite substance is a necessary but not free cause, since it cannot create any thing out of nothing outside of itself: and that all things, bad, good, and indifferent, are nothing else, and can be nothing else, but modifications of the one infinite absolute substance, making itself objective in the creation of things.

Of the freedom and unchangeableness of God.

The attributes which we next have to consider are those which, to our finite understandings, are very difficult to be reconciled, the absolute freedom of God and His unchangeableness. Hermogenes is said to have held,

that God was so unchangeable as to exclude the idea of freedom: on the other hand, the Stoics denied the immutability of God, believing Him to be obnoxious to change. Some have maintained that God is immutable in His substance, but mutable in His decrees and in the acts of His will. The Church of God maintains both truths, that God is absolutely immutable, and also absolutely free, leaving the reconcilement of these two apparently contrariant propositions to a solution in a higher state of intelligence. By the idea of the liberty of God, we understand strictly the power of choice, and the consequent absence of any extrinsic or intrinsic necessity or coaction; so that God can will or not will, act or not act, as He chooses: yet this liberty involves not such imperfection as is found in creatures, such as suspense or deliberation. The idea of the liberty of God is in the order of our minds an anterior idea to that of immutability, in meditating upon His nature and attributes. This truth is clearly announced in Scripture[h]: "Whatsoever the Lord pleased, that did He in heaven, and in earth, and in the sea, and in all deep places." And so St. Paul[i]: "Him

[h] Ps. cxxxviii. 6. [i] Eph. i. 10.

who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will."

By the idea of the immutability of God, we imply nothing else than the negation of a change from condition to condition, or of one state of being to another, either in respect of Himself, or of time, or of any extrinsic circumstance. This also is a matter of Faith. We have the Nicene Anathema. "And those that say there was a time when the Son of God was not, or that He is subject to change or mutability, the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church holdeth accursed." And if this be true of God the Son, à fortiori it is of God the Father, and God the Holy Ghost. And this also is affirmed by Holy Scripture[k]. "God is not a man, that He should lie, neither the Son of man, that He should repent: hath He said, and shall He not do it? or hath He spoken, and shall He not make it good?" "For I am the Lord, I change not[l]." "The Father of lights, with Whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."

Of the infinity, incomprehensibility, and eternity of God.

The three attributes of infinity, incomprehensibility, and eternity, may be fitly joined together, inasmuch as they are held to flow

[k] Numb. xxiii. 19. [l] Mal. iii. 6.

from the principle which the Schoolmen term aseitas, that is, that God is (a se) from Himself. By infinity, we mean supreme and absolute perfection; supreme, in so far as He contains all perfection; absolute, so far as He exceeds it. God being from Himself and His own essence, it follows, that He has in Himself the fulness of being, to which nothing can be added to make Him perfect. Were He not so, He must have some limit either from Himself or from some other source, neither of which suppositions is reasonable. Nay, the very definition of God as a Being, than which nothing better or greater can be supposed, implies this attribute. "Great is the Lord and marvellous, worthy to be praised: there is no end of His greatness[m]."

And so with regard to the other attributes, which are of faith. "The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible. The Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Ghost eternal. And yet there are not three eternals, but one eternal. As also there are not three incomprehensibles, but one incomprehensible[n]." Now as infinity implies a negation of any

[m] Ps. cxlv. 3. [n] Athan. Creed.

limit in essential perfection, so incomprehensibility implies the negation of any limit in substantial presentiality or presence, (as the Schools say,) so far as affects the mode of the Divine existence in itself, as well as all things real and possible. But incomprehensibility must not be confused with ubiquity, for the first is essential to God, the latter is contingent on the existence of place, in other words, on creation. Now with regard to this doctrine, we must believe that God is in all things *by His power*, in so far as all things are subject to Him. He is in all things *by His presence*, in so far as all things are naked and exposed to His sight. He is in all things *by His Being*, in so far as He is present in all things as the cause of their being. "Do I not fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord[o]." "Whither shall I go then from thy Spirit, and whither shall I go then from Thy presence? If I climb up into heaven, Thou art there: if I go down into hell, Thou art there also[p]." "In Him we live, move, and have our being[q]." The idea of eternity in the order of thought follows that of unchangeableness; as the thought of time is consequent upon that of motion. In the idea of the

[o] Jerem. xxiii. 24. [p] Ps. cxxxix. 6, 7. [q] Acts xvii. 28.

eternity of God, no thought of time enters; for those passages in which He is described as "the Ancient of days," or as "He who was, and is, and is to come," are accommodations to our finite understandings, which cannot conceive of Him otherwise. "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever the earth and the world were made, Thou art God from everlasting, and world without end[r]." "Who alone hath immortality[s]."

The knowledge of God.

There are two vital acts of the Divine Substance, to know and to will. As the idea of God, that He is supremely intelligent and all mind, is deeply seated in human nature, there are few who would doubt or deny the knowledge of God. By this we mean a certain evident and immediate cognition, and this Holy Scripture declares to be in God. "For God is a God of knowledge, and by Him actions are weighed[t]:" and the Apostle says, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God[u]!" And reason shews us, that not only must this exist in Him in the

[r] Psalm xc. 2.

[s] 1 Tim. vi. 16. See quotations from the Fathers, in Petavius de Deo lib. iii. c. 4.

[t] 1 Sam. ii. 3.

[u] Rom. xi. 33.

highest degree, but that it must partake of His own attributes of uncompoundedness, immutability, and infinity, inasmuch as "for God to know and to be are one[x]." But beyond the mere fact of the existence of this attribute of knowledge, it is a truth that this knowledge of God is a cause of things, and by its nature efficacious; for it is written, "O Lord, how manifold are Thy works, in wisdom hast Thou made them all:" and, "He hath made the earth by His power, He hath established the earth by His wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by His discretion[y]." On this St. Augustine says[z], "All His creatures, both spiritual and corporeal, not because they are, knoweth He, but for that He knoweth them, they are: for He was not ignorant of what He was about to create, nor did He know His creatures when made, otherwise than before making them." In short, as the knowledge of the artificer is the cause of his handywork, so the knowledge of God is the efficacious cause of all things.

The object of the divine knowledge is what God knows. God knows Himself, and all things out of Himself. The one is the primary, the other is the secondary, object.

[x] S. Aug. Trin. 15. c. 13. [y] Jer. x. 12. [z] loc. cit.

The secondary object, embracing all things that are distinct from the nature of God, includes some things merely possible, others present and future: and of things future, some are necessary, some are free: and of these again, some absolute, and others conditional. Nor is this unreasonable, for to God there is in fact no past nor future, but all things are to Him ever present by His infinite power, whereby all things are, as it were, extended before Him. Every prophecy both in the Old and New Testament is proof of this; and "the eyes of the Lord are ten thousand times brighter than the sun, beholding all the ways of men, and considering the most secret parts. He knew all things ere ever they were created, so also after they were perfected He looked upon them all[a]." "What is foreknowledge," asks St. Augustine, "but the knowledge of the future? What can be future to God, who is above all time? For if the knowledge of God is of very things, they are not future to Him but present, and therefore it must be called 'knowledge,' not 'foreknowledge[b].'" To our frail minds this difficulty at once occurs; How can the foreknowledge of God be reconciled with the freedom of man?

[a] Ecclus. xxiii. 19. [b] Lib. ii. ad Simp. q. ii.

1. What is foreseen must necessarily happen. 2. If human liberty be the power of choosing between two or more, and indifference as to either, certainly before man chooses, his election cannot be known to God. We must therefore either deny the prescience of God, or the liberty of man.

To this it may be answered: that just as the memory of past things has not compelled those past things to have been, so the prescience of God does not compel the future to be. Futurity is not because God has foreseen it, but God has foreseen it because it is to be[c]. And to carry out this truth to its full extent, we must believe that God also knows what may be termed conditional futurity; that is, the things of which the events depend upon some condition annexed to them, thus occupying a middle place between things merely possible, and absolutely future. They would be absolutely future were the condition fulfilled. Thus, granting that if our Lord had preached to the people of Tyre and Sidon, they would have been converted; their conversion was neither merely probable nor absolutely future, but would have taken place if Christ had preached

[c] See St. Aug. cont. Faust. Man. c. 5.

among them, which seeing He did not, neither were they converted. Of this truth both reason and feeling convince us, as may be seen by the common topics of consolation, when adversity or bereavement fall upon the Christian.

The will of God.

Will may be defined as the power of seeking the good and avoiding the evil, recognised by the mind. Since the will of God is identical with His essence, it follows that that will must be one perfect and infinite. Theologians divide the will of God into two kinds, in so far as it tends to different things. These are the will of His good pleasure, (voluntas beneplaciti,) and the will of His signs, (voluntas signi.) The will of good pleasure is that will, properly so called, which really is in God; the will of His signs is called so in a metaphorical sense, seeing that properly it is only the sign of His will, just as we call an instrument, digested by a notary, the will of the testator. For the sign to be true, it must express or signify that will of Him who manifests it, otherwise it were fallacious. Though there are many signs whereby God indicates His will to us, there are five principal ones, i. e. precept, counsel, and operation, in respect of good: prohibition, and permission, in respect of evil.

The will of good pleasure is divided into two kinds; antecedent or first will, consequent or second will. Antecedent will is that which God has from Himself, without reference to any cause connected with His creatures. Such is His will to save the reprobate. His consequent will is that which He has not from Himself, but which is caused and occasioned by His creatures, and it presupposes prescience, not as a cause of the will, but as a reason for the thing being willed (voliti). Such is His will of condemning the reprobate, having foreseen their final impenitence. This will of good pleasure is moreover divided into efficacious and inefficacious; efficacious, according to the words, "For who hath resisted His will[d]:" inefficacious, inasmuch as in some cases God wills something, yet He does not hold Himself to overcome every obstacle; as, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem . . . how often would I have gathered thy children together . . . . and ye would not[e]!" And so we may distinguish an absolute from a conditional will of God.

The question concerning the will of God which most concerns us is, His will with regard to the destinies of mankind. The Jansenists

[d] Rom. ix. 19. [e] Matt. xxiii. 37.

maintained, that God's will of good pleasure is always fulfilled, and therefore concluded that it was not by that will, but by a metaphorical will, that He desires the salvation of all men. Though they admitted the distinction of antecedent and consequent will, yet they maintained that God had the will of saving all men previous to the prevision of original guilt: that consequent upon that prevision God only willed to save the elect and predestinated: whence it follows, that Christ died only for the elect; while for the salvation of the rest, God had only a metaphorical will, and in this latter will only Christ died for the reprobate.

Now the Church maintains, on the contrary, that God, supposing the existence of original sin, desires by the real and antecedent will of His good pleasure the salvation of all men, and that Christ died for all men. Thus the Apostle; "I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and eucharists, be made for all men; .... for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; who *will* have *all* men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a

ransom *for all*, to be testified in due time[f]." Now this text seems quite sufficient to prove our point, if we take St. Augustine's rule, that the words of Scripture are to be taken in their proper sense, and in all their extent, unless other words of Scripture, or some evident reason or tradition, should demand otherwise. But this text is confirmed and strengthened by other passages of Holy Scripture; such as, "The Lord is not slack concerning His promise, as some men count slackness; but is long suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that *all* should come to repentance[g]." On which text St. Augustine says[h], "God wills that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth, but not so as to take away the free will, using which well or ill, they shall be most justly judged." And St. Prosper, interpreting the mind of Augustine, says, "Putting aside the discretion which the Divine knowledge contains within the secret place of His justice, we must most sincerely believe and confess that God wills that all men should be saved. For verily the Apostle, whose opinion this is, earnestly enjoins that which is most piously

[f] 1 Tim. ii. 1, 3. [g] 2 Pet. iii. 9. [h] De Spiritu et Lit.

preserved in all the Churches, that prayer should be offered to God for all men. Consequently that many are lost, is the reward of them that are lost: that many are saved, is the free gift of Him who saveth them." The Council of Quiercy, or Chiersy, A.D. 848, held under the influence of Hincmar, against Gotheschalcus, affirms as its third Canon, that God wills that all men should be saved[i].

As to the other part of the proposition, that Christ died for all men, we may quote the words of the Apostle: "Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came *upon all men* unto justification of life[k]:" and, "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for our sins only, but for those of the whole world[l]." As none was free from guilt, so He came to save all. The Sun of righteousness has risen on all, He came to all, He suffered for all. He that believeth not on Christ, defrauds himself of the general good; just as if a man were to shut out the rays of the sun with shutters, yet the sun has not the less risen upon all, because he excludes

[i] See Carranza Conc. p. 818. [k] Rom. v. 18. [l] 1 John ii. 2.

the light. Thus has Christ died for all, but all shall not receive benefit from His death: they only to whom the merit of His Passion is communicated[m].

This accounts for the apparent limitation of these general promises in Scripture. Thus our Lord says, that "He came to give His life a ransom *for many*[n]." And, "this is the Cup of the New Testament, which is shed for you and *for many*[o]." Our Lord here alludes to what He foresaw would be the result of His death for all men, that only some would be saved. Christ the Lord came to redeem the whole human race, which was covered with guilt original and actual, and so offered Himself a victim for the sins of the whole world, and merited all the necessary graces, cooperating with which man can obtain everlasting life. Some obey this grace, others resist it. They who obey are saved, they who resist perish everlastingly. If then we speak of Christ's intention and desire, we say, He died for all men; if we speak with regard to the end, we say, for many.

Providence of God.

Connected with the knowledge and will of God is the thought of His Providence and

[m] 1 Cor. viii. 11. [n] Matt. xx. 28. [o] Matt. xxvi. 28. comp. Luke xxii. 20.

Predestination. Providence has been defined as, "Ratio ordinis rerum in finem in Deo existens." It includes two things, the ordination of things to their end, and the execution of that ordination by fitting means. The one regards the intellect, the other the will. The Bible is full of allusions to the providence of God. Perhaps the strongest passages are those in the Sermon on the Mount[p], in which our Lord distinctly says, that the birds of the air, the lilies of the field, the grass, and the hairs of our head, are so much the subjects of the providence of God, that not one of them alters its condition without His permission. Hence even the most trifling circumstance in human affairs is ordained or permitted by God. Nor is this unreasonable; for if God, being possessed of infinite wisdom, does nothing by chance, it is necessary that His providence should extend as far as His actions, and both reach to the most minute things. But yet God does not always provide for things *immediately*, but acts much by second causes and by way of means; not from the deficiency of power, but from the abundance of His goodness, as a holy man says. And whichever way He may work,

p Matt. vi. 26. Luke xii.

either mediately or immediately, He ever obtains the general end, that is, His glory; but not always particular ends, for He does not intend all things absolutely, but in some cases conditionally.

And all this we must bear strongly in mind, for there are very mysterious providences. The success of the wicked was almost enough to shake the faith of the Psalmist; and the question ever rises in the heart of man, "Wherefore do the wicked live, become old, yea, are mighty in power[q]?" Yet the very unequal distribution of the goods of this life helps to solve the question, inasmuch as it forms a clear evidence, that there must be a future state, and we should not in our calculations look on this world without also taking into consideration the next also. Hence the sorrows, contumelies, and pains which vex the just, are sent to them, either "to try their patience for the example of others, or that their faith may be found in the day of the Lord, laudable, glorious, and honourable, to the increase of glory, and endless felicity, or else to correct and amend whatsoever in them may offend the eyes of their Heavenly Father."

[q] Job xxi. 7.

And as to the prosperity of the wicked, as God rewards every good action, may not their prosperity be the reward of the few good actions they have performed? And may not God by His mercies be yet calling them to Him before He abandons them for ever?

Of Predestination.

Predestination is defined by St. Augustine to be nothing else than "the prescience and preparation of the blessings of God, whereby they are most certainly set free, who are set free[r];" and St. Thomas[s] defines it as "a certain rule of ordination of certain persons to eternal life, existing in the Divine mind." Thus, predestination embraces two things; an act of the intellect, and an act of the will of God; the first is the prescience and providence, the second is the work of mercy. Predestination has been divided by theologians into adequate and inadequate. Adequate predestination is a free election to grace and glory, inadequate predestination is an election to glory only.

The first of these predestinations must be regarded, both as to intention and as to execution, that is, in the ratio of principle and of term. So far as regards the execution or term of predestination, or, as the Schoolmen

[r] De Dono Persev. c. 14. [s] p. 1. q. 23. ar. 2.

say, in the concrete, two things are required, the grace of God, and the cooperation of man; for eternal life, which is the term of predestination, is the reward and crown of righteousness, which is given only to those who strive lawfully. As regards predestination as to intention, or in the abstract, sound theologians are divided. One class hold, that predestination is gratuitous *in se*, that is, that God by a gratuitous decree, before foreseeing any cooperation with grace, has elected certain from the universal mass of perdition, into which mankind have fallen by original sin; the others being left in this aforesaid mass of perdition, and therefore negatively reprobated. Then when this election is made, God has decreed to give those graces, whereby the elect or predestinate most certainly arrive at the glory prepared for them. The other class of theologians hold a predestination gratuitous *in causâ*, that is, they hold that God has first elected men to grace, and then, from the foreseen good or bad use of that grace, has decreed some to glory and others to shame; or, in other words, that predestination to glory is made after the foreseen rewards of grace.

For the first view are quoted the texts,

"And as many as were ordained to eternal life, believed[t]." "According as He hath chosen us in Him, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love, having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will[u]." Also the argument[v] about Jacob and Esau; a similar case to which, St. Augustine puts, in the matter of two infants, of whom one is baptized, and the other cannot attain to baptism.

For the latter view are quoted those texts, which give no other account of the election of some to glory, than a cooperation with grace. As, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was an hungred, and ye gave Me to eat[x]," &c. &c. Also the text, "For whom He did foreknow, He did also predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son[y]." "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall[z]."

[t] Acts xiii. 48. [u] Eph. iv. 5. [v] Rom. ix. 11.
[x] Matt. xxv. 34 et seq. [y] Rom. ix. 29. [z] 2 Pet. i. 10.

Both these opinions are permissible, if we admit a certain and immutable predestination of God: we incline to the latter; but be it ever recollected, that this is a profound and impenetrable mystery to our weakness. We cannot search it out. Many of the disputes that have rent the vesture of Christ have been on this subject. Well says St. Augustine[b], Jam si ad illam profunditatem scrutandam quisquam nos coarctet, cur ille ita suadeatur ut persuadeatur, illi autem non ita; duo solum occurrunt interim quæ respondere mihi placeat, 'O Altitudo divitiarum' et 'nunquid iniquitas est apud Deum.' Cui ista responsio displicet, quærat doctiores, sed caveat ne inveniat præsumptiores.

To the doctrine of Predestination, there are certainly many difficulties, and as held by Calvinists it tends directly to lower Christianity. Men may say, 1. that it makes God a respecter of persons, to elect some and reject others, independently of their merit or demerit; and men may argue, (as many do argue,) 2. 'I am either predestinated or not predestinated: if I am predestinated, whatever I do I shall be saved: if I am not predestinated, whatever I do I shall

[a] Cf. Suarez de Effect. Predest. [b] De Sp. et Lit. c. 34.

be lost.' Thus the result is either presumption or despair, and the whole inducements to penitence and virtue are weakened. In answer to (1) the first objection, it must be said, This would be true, if God owed any thing to any one; but He does not. Moreover, inasmuch as God confers grace on all men, lightening every man that cometh into the world, on the theory above mentioned, that predestination to glory is after the cooperation with grace is foreseen, it follows, that the sinner must ascribe his reprobation to his own abuse of the grace given. As regards (2) the second objection on this theory, it may be answered, You shall be predestinated if you continue unto the end; otherwise, you shall be lost. So one may say to a sick man, You shall be cured if you take medicine; if you refuse, you die. Since God wills the salvation of all men, it is man's fault if he be lost.

The final cause of Predestination is the glory of God; the efficient cause is the determination of God to give grace and glory; the meritorious cause is the death of Christ; the instrumental cause, the cooperation with the grace given on the part of the predestinate.

The effects of Predestination are vocation,

justification, and glorification. "For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called; and whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified (ἐδόξασε)[c]." This glorification may be taken in two senses; either for the blessedness in the world to come, or for the collation of those gifts which make men glorious. Among the effects of the divine predestination are the gifts of genius, disposition, &c. and all the sorrows of our pilgrimage here on earth, the chastisements of God's fatherly hand.

Of Reprobation.

The logical consequence of predestination unto life eternal, is a predestination to death, or what divines call Reprobation; and in a certain sense it may be admitted, so far as it implies the permission of sin, the refusal of grace, and the decree of condemnation, and so far as sin is the immediate cause of reprobation. But we must not hold with the Calvinists, that God of His own good pleasure, and before foreseeing their sins, has positively

[c] Rom. viii. 29, 30.

reprobated some men, that is, has destined them from all eternity to everlasting punishment. The consequence of which theory is, that God not only denies them grace, but impels them to sin. Neither must we hold with the same heretics, that the cause of this reprobation is God's good pleasure, or with Jansenius, that it is original sin; which two phases of belief are represented by the words, Supralapsarian and Sublapsarian.

We hold, on the contrary, that it is impious to assert, that God of His own good pleasure has positively reprobated certain persons, and destined them to everlasting punishment, without any prevision of foregoing sin. "Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God, and not that He should return from His ways, and live[d]?" If this be so, how can we think He should destine any to everlasting fire without the foresight of their sins? "The Lord . . . not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance[e]." And in Scripture, we find no cause of damnation but sin. "Go from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire . . . for I was an hungred, and ye gave Me not[f]."

[d] Ezek. xviii. 23. [e] 2 Pet. xviii. 9. [f] Matt. xxiii. 41.

"God is good," says St. Augustine; "God is just: He can save some without any merit, for He is good: He cannot damn any except for ill-deservings, for He is just[g]." God destines none to sin, else He were the author of sin. Man's will is free. St. Prosper[h]; "No one is therefore made by God, that he may perish: because there is one cause for being made, another for perishing. The cause of men's being made is the bounty of the Creator; the cause of their being lost is the reward of (Adam's) sin."

Argument of the Romans.

It ought to be noted, with regard to the strong passages in the Epistle to the Romans, that the whole scope of the Epistle is to prove the gratuitous or free calling of men to faith. When all men, both Jews and Gentiles, were under sin, and in need of the grace of God, of His own free bounty, without any antecedent merits, He called the Gentiles to the faith, and justly reprobated the Jews on account of their unbelief. To confirm this, the Apostle adduces the case of Esau and Jacob, in which God, so far as a temporal blessing was concerned, preferred the latter to the former in a like case; and so with regard to Pharaoh and Nebuchadnezzar, the one He hardened, and the other

[g] Lib. iii. cont. Jul. c. xviii. [h] Resp. 3. Vincent.

He had compassion on. So with regard to two sinners, if God has mercy on the one, and leaves the other in his sins, all we can say is, that in one case God exercises His mercy, in the other His justice. But in any case it is evident, that sin, and sin only, is the cause of reprobation.

There are other attributes of God, such as truth, goodness, felicity, and beauty, but they are so closely connected with the idea of Him, that we may pass on from them to the consideration of His nature.

Adumbration of the Doctrine of the Trinity.

Now besides these attributes which we have mentioned, we find in the Scripture certain other peculiar attributes and manifestations (as they would seem) of the Godhead, more obscure than the former. Such is what is called the Spirit of God, a word, denoting creative energy, or preserving power, or gifts from on high. And such is the wisdom of God, and such the name, the word, and glory of God. And something there is connected with the mention of these, which shews that they are not merely attributes; the passages in which they occur are strangely worded, and, as it were, prepare us for the fresh light thrown upon them in the New Testament. There we find

these manifestations of the Divine Essence invested with *personality*, and concentrated, and fixed in two, the Word and the Spirit. The Word comes as often to be called the Son of God, and to appear to possess such strict personal attributes, as to be able to assume our nature without ceasing to be what He was before; and the Spirit is declared not only to have been seen twice, but has His Personality and Office accurately revealed[i].

The doctrine of the Trinity.

In the One God then, the Faith reveals to us that there is a Trinity of Persons. That theological term, though not found in Holy Scripture, has been adopted by the Church to express this divine mystery. "The Trinity is not an enumeration of diverse things, but a combination of things equal and of the same value; the name making those one, who by nature are one, and not allowing those to be separated numerically, who are not divided in reality[k]. It was used at the Synod of Alexandria, A. D. 317, though some think that it had a prior authority.

If the Christian faith concerning the Trinity consist in admitting three Persons, really distinct in a numerical unity of essence; it follows, that

[i] Newman's Arians. [k] Greg. Naz. Orat. 23. p. 431.

these Persons must be coeternal, coequal, and consubstantial with each other: that the One must proceed from the Other, the Son from the Father by eternal generation: the Holy Spirit by way of procession from the Father and the Son, as from one principle.

And being convinced that the Three Persons are mysteriously united in one nature from all eternity, the believer is able to give a consistent account of the other truths of Christianity. He can consistently with this belief assert, that one Person of the ever-blessed Trinity took upon Him our nature, and remained undivided from God, retaining His nature as God, and His distinct personality, while He took the manhood into God. By saying this, he neither divides the substance of God, by saying, that part of Him became incarnate, instead of saying that one Person of the Godhead took upon Him our nature: nor (as the Sabellians do) confounds the Persons by calling them only three different manifestations of the same Person. By believing in a Trinity of Persons, he is relieved from the necessity of the blasphemy of the discerptibility of God, and by believing in a unity of nature, from the folly of dividing the essence of the Infinite. And

when he asserts, that one Person of the all-glorious Trinity took upon Him our nature, he does not thereby assert His unchangeable divine nature to be subject to our passions, or diminish aught from His eternal perfections, but that He through His divine nature made flesh to be divine, seeing that He did not destroy His body, but took it up to heaven, where it now ministers to the Christian's good in divers ways. To believe Him to have taken into God our nature, is easier than to believe that He is the soul of the world, (as the Stoics said;) and to believe that there are distinct Persons in the Godhead, than that He separated all creatures from His own essence, (as the Pantheists assert:) to believe that He has now a human body in heaven, to which He will liken the bodies of the saints at last, according to His mighty working, is an easier task, than that our bodies and all matter in the universe are an unreality[1].

In the Old Testament we find this doctrine only shadowed forth. It exists there, so that we who now read the Scripture by the light of the Church's faith and of the New Testament can see it plainly, but it was in mercy held

[1] Morris's Prize Essay, p. 368.

back from the people just redeemed from Egypt, lest accustomed to the Polytheism of Heathendom, they should in their recognition of the Three Persons fall into that error[m]. The doctrine was gradually developed, and no doubt, though we find small record of it in the Sacred Scriptures, there did exist a higher amount of belief in the supernatural verities of revelation than we should have gathered from the letter of the Law and the Prophets. This is confirmed by the Pharisaic belief in a future state, which, though no where mentioned in what is usually termed Canonical Scripture, is borne witness to by the Apocrypha, and adopted and subscribed to by the great Apostle St. Paul.

St. Greg. Nazianzen[n] says, "The Old Testament proclaimed the Father openly, the Son more obscurely. For it was not safe, while the Father's Godhead was not yet confessed, that the Son should be openly proclaimed, or that, while that of the Son was not received, the

[m] See St. Basil. de Mose. Orat. 9. p. 54. *οὔπω τὴν τριάδα κηρύττειν καιρός*. See also Theodoret, Therap. Serm. ii. t. 4. p. 469. *ἐν Αἰγυπτῷ αὐτοὺς πλεῖστον*, &c. See Jobius in Biblioth. Photii, cod. 122. p. 612. Comment. lib. vii. chap. 27. cit. Suic.

[n] Orat. 31. p. 572.

burden of a belief in the divinity of the Holy Spirit should be laid on."

Of all the texts in the Old Testament, which shadow forth the adorable Trinity, that in Genesis i. "Let *us* make man in our image," is the strongest. S. Greg. Nyssen says, "Thou hast learnt that (here) there are two Persons, one who speaketh, the other addressed. For why did He not say 'make,' (ποίησον,) and not 'let us make man,' ποιήσωμεν? That thou mayest understand a Lordship, lest recognising the Father thou shouldest be ignorant of the Son: that thou shouldest know that the Father made all things by the Son, and that the Son created by the will of the Father, and that thou shouldest praise the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Holy Spirit. Thus thou thyself art their common work, that thou mightest be the worshipper of both, not severing the worship, but acknowledging the Unity of Godhead." Theodoret beautifully connects this truth with an ordinance that was to be ordained in later times. Commenting on this passage, he says, "And therefore in this place, since God made a reasoning creature, which after many generations He would restore, by instituting holy Baptism in the invoca-

tion of the Holy Trinity, when He was going to create that nature which was to receive that mystery, He enigmatically revealed the unity of Substance and the diversity of Persons. For where it is written, "God said," the communion of the Divine Nature is indicated; but when it is added, "Let us make," the number of Persons is expressed. So where the word "image" is used in the singular, the oneness of Nature is evidenced; but where "our" is added to it, the number of Persons is declared[o].

Of a similar nature to this text are the following:

"God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them . . . . Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made He man[p]."

"Go to, let *us* go down, and there confound their language[q]."

"Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven[r]."

"By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the Spirit of His mouth[s]."

[o] Quæst. 19. in Gen. p. 18. [p] Gen. ix. 6.
[q] Gen. xi. 7. [r] Gen. xix. 24. [s] Ps. xxxiii. 6.

"Behold, the man is become as one of *us*[t]."

"The seraphim cried to one another, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth[u]."

"The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand[x]."

Lastly, the eighteenth chapter of Genesis is by some understood to reveal the Trinity. The English Church, by reading the Lesson on Trinity Sunday, seems to point that way; but though the phraseology is striking, yet there are difficulties in this interpretation which make it that, while it may tend to edify the Christian, it is hardly safe to use it as an argument against unbelievers.

In the New Testament the doctrine is more clearly stated. Much stress has always been placed upon the form of Baptism, "Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The Fathers of the second Œcumenical Council at Constantinople write thus concerning the Nicene Faith. "This ought to be satisfactory to you, and to us, and to all who do not pervert the word of the true faith, as being most ancient, and *conformable to baptism*, and teaching us to believe in the Name of the Father,

[t] Gen. iii. 22. [u] Is. vi. 3. [x] Ps. cx. 1.

and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, so that clearly there shall be believed one Godhead, Power, and Substance, of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, equal dignity, and coeternal kingdom, in three perfect hypostases, (ὑποστάσεις,) or in three perfect persons (πρόσωπα[y]). The very structure of the original Greek was supposed to meet the opposite heresies of Arius and Sabellius.

Our Lord also, teaching the same doctrine, says, "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, He shall bear witness of Me[z]." Here three distinct Persons are named, and their common nature is inculcated, for that which emanates from God must be God; a truth further confirmed by the text[a], "I came forth from the Father."

Thus again[b], "I will pray the Father, and He will send you *another* Comforter." And so to Philip[c], "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father. Believe ye not that I am in the Father and the Father in Me? The words which I speak unto you I speak not of Myself;

[y] Theodoret. Hist. Eccl. Lib. v. cap. 9. in p. 1031. Hala 1771. [z] John xv. 26. [a] John xvi. 28. [b] John xiv. 16. [c] Ver. 8.

the Father abiding in Me, He doeth the works."

From these passages we learn, 1. That one action and efficiency is attributed to the Father and the Son, and therefore one nature. 2. A communication between the Father and the Son, (commeatio), which could only subsist with identity of nature. 3. The fact, that seeing One implies the seeing the Other, shews that their substances cannot be diverse; all which, added to that which our Lord says of the Holy Ghost, tend to prove, that one and the same nature and substance is to be predicated of the three Persons.

Another comparative argument from Scripture are the words, "Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand;" which in Isaiah vi. 9. are applied to the Father; in John xii. 40. to the Son; and in Acts xxviii. 26. to the Holy Ghost[e].

But the strongest text is that of 1 John v. 7. "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one;" concerning which

[e] For further Scriptural arguments, the reader is referred to Jones of Nayland's Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity, c. iii.

there has been so much controversy. Unitarians and others maintain, that it has been foisted into the text from being a gloss in the margin. It is wanting in nearly all Greek manuscripts. It does not occur in the old Italic version, neither is it alleged by St. Augustine against the Arian Maximinus. On the other hand, it is quoted by Tertullian and St. Cyprian. It is quoted in the fifth century by a Council of African Bishops against the Arian Vandals. St. Jerome gives it, and therefore must have found it in the manuscripts of Palestine; and Erasmus, R. Stephanus, and the Complutensians, and in later times Mill, Burgess, and Bengel, believe in its genuineness.

The voice of Catholic antiquity on the subject of the Holy Trinity is harmonious. Although, before heresies sprung up, individual Fathers may have used incautious or incomplete language, yet no one can help admiring the admirable consent which runs through their works. St. Greg. Nazianzen[f] says, "Teaching us to acknowledge one unbegotten God, that is, the Father; and one begotten Lord, that is, the Son; and one Holy Spirit,

[f] Orat. 25. p. 446.

which went forth or proceeded from the Father, God to those who intelligently apprehend what is before them." Elsewhere[g], "We adore the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit; one Godhead; God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; one nature in three individualities, (ἰδιότησι,) intelligent, perfect, separately personal, distinct in number, but not in Deity[h]." "The Christian must believe in a Trinity, consubstantial, of equal honour, and of equal power, (ὁμόθρονον,) combined in one Godhead. We believe in the Trinity in Unity; we glorify the Unity in Trinity; the Trinity, as regarding the Godhead in three persons or hypostases; the Unity, in that these are of one nature and divinity, and one God. For we believe in one God, though He is known in the Trinity, and we acknowledge one Lord, though He appears (δεικνύται) in three Persons."

St. Epiphanius says[i], "All the brethren salute you; do you also salute all the brethren that are with you, that is, all faithful believers of the true faith, who are opposed to pride, who hate the communion of the Arians and the frowardness of the Sabellians, who adore

[g] Orat. 25. p. 441. [h] Harmenopulus de Fide Orthod.
[i] Hær. 78. p. 1050. ed. Petav.

the Consubstantial Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three hypostases, in one substance, in one Godhead, and in general in one ascription of praise, (καὶ ἁπαξαπλῶς μιαν δοξολογίαν): who believe also rightly concerning the salutary dispensation and incarnate presence of the Saviour, believing perfectly the Incarnation of Christ, the same perfect God and perfect man, without sin, who assumed a body from Mary, with a soul and spirit, and all things that belong to man, save only sin: not two, but one Christ, one God, one King, one High-Priest, God and man, man and God, not two but one, united not for confusion, nor for annihilation (ἀνυπαρξίαν), but for the great dispensation of love.

Circumsession.

In meditating upon the adorable Trinity, while we assert the distinction of Persons, we must not only hold the bare truth of the unity of Substance, but we must also reverently fix upon our minds the truth of the existence of the circumsession or commeation of the three Persons. This word, sometimes termed circumincession, and by the Greeks perienchoresis, or perichoresis[j], is that property

[j] The term perichoresis is applied by authors after St. Gregory of Nazianzum to the communicatio idiomatum.

by which the divine Persons, by reason of the identity of their natures, communicate with each other. It is the internal existence of one Person in the other, without confusion of person or of personality. In this sense, St. Fulgentius[k] says, "The whole Father is in the Son and in the Holy Spirit: the whole Son is in the Father and in the Holy Spirit: the whole Holy Spirit is in the Father and the Son." It is to this that our Lord alludes, "I am in the Father and the Father in Me[l]." This property tends very much to teach us at once the distinction, and the consubstantiality of the Persons. "If any one truly receive the Son, he will find that He brings with Him, on the one hand, the Father, on the other, the Holy Spirit. For neither can He be severed from the Father, who is ever of and in the Father: nor again disunited from His own Spirit, who operates all things by means of It; . . . for we must not conceive separation or division in any way; as if either the Son could be conceived of without the Father, or the Spirit disunited from the Son. For there is discovered between them some ineffable

[k] Lib. de Fid. c. i. n. 4. [l] John xiv. 11. See St. Thomas, p. 1. q. 2. ar. 3.

and incomprehensible both union and distinction[m]."

The two chief errors into which men have fallen with regard to the Adorable Trinity are Sabellianism and Tritheism.

Sabellianism.

The first of these confounds the Persons, and denies the Trinity, by asserting that they are only three names or characters of one person. Before Sabellius lived, Praxeas had given utterance to a similar error. He held, that "God the Father Almighty was Jesus Christ; that He died and suffered, and sitteth at His own right hand." This was anciently called υἱοπατορία. Hermogenes and Noetus followed in the same steps. Of the opinions of Sabellius himself, Theodoret remarks[n], "He said that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, were one hypostasis, and one person with a triple name. And he called the Same, sometimes the Father, sometimes the Son, and sometimes the Holy Ghost; that He legislated in the Old Testament as Father, was incarnate in the New as Son, and came to the Apostles as the Holy Ghost." St. Basil the Great had the acuteness to observe a connexion, which may still be traced among those of Sabellian tendency in

[m] S. Basil. cit. Newman. [n] Hæret. Fab. lib. ii. c. 9.

the present day. "Sabellianism is Judaism, brought into evangelical teaching on a false disguise of Christianity. For he who calls the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, one thing of many names, and makes one of the three Persons, what else does he do? Does he not deny the eternal essence of the Only-Begotten which was before the world? He denies the dispensation of His dwelling among men, His descent into hell, the resurrection, and the judgment. He denies also the separate energizings of the Spirit[o]." We have the infection of this error in the Montanists, Marcellus, and Paul of Samosata.

Epiphanius[p] says, "For he, and his followers the Sabellians, teach, that the same is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as if there were three names to one person; or as in man, there is body, soul, and spirit; the body is, so to speak, the Father; the soul the Son; and as is the spirit in man, so is the Holy Ghost in the Deity." He uses the Catholic illustrations of the sun and the ray, but distorts them. He says, in the sun is a triple energy, i. e. the power of giving light, the power of warming, and a round figure of the sun itself, which we

[o] Epist. 210. p. 315. [p] Hær. 62.

term the disk; the power of warmth answers to the Spirit, that of light to the Son, and the Father is the form of the entire Person: further, that the Son, sent forth as a ray at a certain time, after the Gospel work was finished returned to His Author, as a ray propagated from the sun returns to the same. The Fathers dwell on the ἀθεία, the godless tendency of Sabellianism, inasmuch that by destroying the distinction of the Persons in the Deity, they produce a confusion, which does not tend so much to make all one as to make each none.

Tritheism.

The contrary error to Sabellianism is Tritheism, whereby men have held, that in the Trinity are three substances in all things similar, as if there were three deities. Severus, Theodosius, and Johannes Philoponus, in the time of the emperor Phocas, held this error.

And in the last century, it is believed that a well-known sect, called the Hutchinsonians—earnest men, who did good service in their day to the Church, and who counted among their number many respected names—held a doctrine concerning three inoriginate Persons, which in its legitimate consequences would have led to a species of Tritheism.

Theodoret also[q] mentions an obscure sect called the Peratæ, who maintained the doctrine of three Gods. Philoponus[r] erred from applying the word Person in too exclusively a human sense. Person in things human refers to the mode of existence, and implies perfect individuality (αὐτοτελῶς), but it is not so in the Persons of God. It may be questioned, however, whether Philoponus really accepted a principle so subversive of all Christianity, or whether Tritheism was the logical consequence of his error fixed upon him by his opponents. St. Cyril of Jerusalem[s] says, that Marcion first of all said, that there were three Gods.

"Now we must neither distribute into three Deities the awful and divine Unity, nor diminish the infinite dignity and majesty of our Lord by the notion of His being a creature; but we must put our trust in God the Father Almighty, and in Christ Jesus His Son, and in the Holy Spirit: and believe that the Word is ever one by nature with the Supreme God. For He says, 'I and the Father are One;' and, 'I am in the Father and the Father in Me.' For thus the Divine Trinity and the holy doctrine of the Unity will be safe." Dionysius

[q] Lib. i. de Hær. [r] Petav. Trin. iv. q. 16. [s] Cat. xvi.

of Rome says, "For it is of necessity that the Divine Word should be united to the God of all, and that the Holy Spirit should rest and dwell in God, (ἡνῶσθαι γὰρ ἀνάγκη τῷ Θεῷ τῶν ὅλων τὸν Θεῖον Λόγον· ἐμφιλοχωρεῖν δὲ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐνδιαιτᾶσθαι δεῖ τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα.)" Tertullian says, "The union of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Paraclete, implies Three conjoined, which three are one thing, not one Person." ("Connexus Patris in Filio et Filii in Paracleto, tres efficit cohærentes, qui tres unum sint, non unus.")

III.

OF GOD THE FATHER.

THE FATHER ALMIGHTY.

THE expression, Father, when applied to God, may be taken in two ways. It may be used either essentially for the Three Persons of the Trinity, or it may be taken personally, as applying to the First Person only.

Essentially, then, the word Father is applied to God, 1. in respect of all creatures, inasmuch as He like a father made them, and sustains them with a father's care. Even the heathen, who in the idea of God understood an eternal substance, from whom all things arose, and who ruled all things by His providence, used this expression of Father to describe Him, who was the beneficent Maker and Guardian of all things. And we find the Holy Scripture using the same expression in this sense, when, in speaking of God, they would indicate His creative

power, and admirable governance; as, "Is not He thy Father that hath bought thee? hath He not made thee and established thee[a]?" "Doubtless Thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not[b]." 2. In respect of the faithful, whom He has adopted as His children. "For it was not unbecoming in God to be the Father of them, whose brother Christ has made Himself," says S. Bernard. For indeed generally in the New Testament, God is called the Father of Christians, who have not "received the spirit of bondage to fear, but have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby they cry, Abba, Father[c]." "For such love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God [d]." "And if children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ[e]." "For which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren[f]."

Personally, the word Father is applied to God the Father; for this is His proper name. A true confession of Him is to be found in a letter of S. Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, in Theodoret[g]. "We believe in one unbegotten

[a] Deut. xxxi. 6. [b] Is. lxiii. 16. [c] Rom. viii. 15.
[d] 1 John iii. 1. [e] Rom. viii. 17. [f] Heb. ii. 11.
Hist. Eccl. i. c. 3. vol. iii. p. 742.

Father, who hath no author of His existence, unchangeable, unalterable, always the same, suffering neither increase nor diminution, the Giver of the Law and the Prophets and the Gospels, the Lord of Patriarchs and Apostles, and of all Saints."

He is termed the Father in respect of the Son. "When thou hearest the word Father, understand the Father of a Son who is the image of the aforesaid substance. For as no one is called Lord, unless he have a Lordship, or a slave to order; and as no one is called Master unless he have a disciple; so the Father can in no way be spoken of, but as having a Son[h]." "Father is not a name of substance nor of action, but of relation. It indicates that relation which the Father has to the Son, or the Son to the Father[i]." "The Father, is the principle, (or Ἀρχή,) not only as regards His creatures, which He shares with the other Persons of the Trinity, but He is also the principle in the order of origin, in respect of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. He is the fountain of the supersubstantial Deity. Nay, He is termed the cause, αἰτία, of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, the word cause being used not as instrumental,

[h] Ruf. in Expos. Symb. [i] S. Greg. Naz. Orat. 35.

but as originative[l]." He is also termed, the root and head of the Son, and the προβολεὺς of the Holy Spirit. "We confess that the Father is not begotten, nor created, but unbegotten. He derives His origin from none, and from Him the Son derives generation, and the Spirit procession[m]."

Yet when we term the Father the first Person, we are not to use it as if in the adorable Trinity there was any one before or after, any one greater or less than another. The true religion ascribes the same eternity, and the same majesty and glory, to the Three Persons. Yet we call the Father the first, because He is the principle without principle.

That which distinguishes Him from the other Persons of the adorable Trinity is, that He is the Unbegotten. St. Cyril observes, that this attribute of being unbegotten is not necessarily consequent upon His Paternity, but is predicated in contradistinction to the Filiation of the Son. "I would say, if we would think rightly, that He is unbegotten, but that He is not necessarily unbegotten because He is the Father, but because He has not been begotten of any, but exists in an unbegotten way,

[l] S. Chrys. Hom. x. ad 1 Cor.

[m] Concil. Tolet. 11.

having, by generation, His own Son, of Himself and in Himself[n]." To be unbegotten and to be the Father then are not the same thing.

The name of the Father is applied to Him rather than simply God; as we say, "Our Father, which art in Heaven," as it is a higher attribute to have begotten the Son, than to have made the worlds. Wherefore our Lord says, "I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God," when He places the Paternity first in order. The first here refers to the Son, the latter to creatures. The thought of the generation of the Son whereby He is Father, is prior to that of the creation of all things whereby He is God[o].

"The Father Almighty." The word "Almighty" is found by those who accurately investigate to mean nothing else in the divine power, than the relation of the creative energy to the phænomena of the world. (ἢ τὸ πρὸς τί πως ἔχειν τὴν κρατητικὴν τῶν ἐν τῇ κτίσει θεωρουμένων ἐνέργειαν.) The word Almighty (παντοκράτωρ) shews this. For as there would be no physician were there no sick; and as there would be none merciful, and compassionate, and such like, did none stand in need of them; so there

[n] S. Cyr. Alex. t. v. 420. [o] Cyr. t. v. 40.

would be none Almighty unless creation required one to control it, and to keep it in being. Therefore, as the physician is for him who needs a cure, so the Almighty is for that which requires to be controlled. And as they that are whole need not a physician but they that are sick, so it may justly be inferred, that that requires no control in which nature is infallible and unchangeable. Therefore, when we hear the word "Almighty," we understand this, that God maintains in being all things, whether they be things intellectual, or are of the material nature. Therefore holdeth He the circle of the earth: therefore hath He in His hands the ends of the earth: therefore holdeth He the heavens in the palm of His hand: therefore measureth He the waters with His hand: therefore containeth He in Himself all the intelligent creation, that all things may remain in their own being, every way upheld by His encircling power[p].

It will be observed, that in this description there is an additional meaning given to the word which our language fails to convey. It seems to imply not only all-powerful, but all-

[p] G. Nyss. Orat. 2. cont. Eunom.

containing. Hence one definition has been given, "God is called by that name, because He holds and contains all things; for the height of heaven, and the depth of the abyss, and the ends of the earth, are in His hands[q]."

Since the word omnipotent signifies a power over all persons and things, it may properly and personally be applied to the Father, for from Him all things do proceed, and He is the fountain and origin of all being, and by His power, and as the principle of them, He comprehends all things, both created and increate. But this very power which containeth all things, in so far as it is personal, He communicates to the Son and to the Spirit, wherefore not less to both of these does the word Almighty apply, though peculiarly it belongs to the Father[r]. "So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty: and yet there are not three Almighties, but one Almighty."

[q] Theoph. i. ad Autolyc.

[r] Petav. Trin. vi. 6.

IV.

OF CREATION.

THE MAKER OF HEAVEN AND EARTH, AND OF ALL THINGS VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE.

WHEN one comes to think of it, there is perhaps no greater mystery than that there should be such a thing as creation. God has been from eternity. In comparison with the eternity of God, creation is but of yesterday; for if we fix our minds upon it, we come to contemplate the fact, that for millions and millions of ages, God, the Father the Son and the Holy Ghost, was alone, the only Existence that was. He was in rest, He had nothing to care for. He had none to govern, to correct, to bless. He was good, but He had nothing to exercise His benevolence on. He was great, but there was none to fear Him. There was silence, for there was nothing but God. And though thus in rest, He was perfectly happy and self-suffi-

cient, for happiness and self-sufficience are of the attributes of God, and so an eternity rolled on, and ages upon ages passed. At length it pleased God to change this, and to surround Himself by creation, a creation beautiful indeed in the beginning, but soon depraved, which bears witness still to its original admirable adaptation and order, but which also gives too strong evidence of its subsequent deterioration. Why should God have done this? Why should he have created beings, some uncertain of their ultimate destiny, others sure to fall? Why did the all-sufficient God make the Angels to sing His praises, or the sons of men to take their seats upon the vacant thrones in heaven? Why did the all-merciful God allow the devil to be, or make hell, and death, and pain, and the never-dying worm? These are questions before which we must bow in reverent submission, sure that not on this side of the grave shall the reason be revealed to us. Like the other great difficulty, the existence and extent of evil, we must admit the fact, and not seek reasons for it. Our daily experience convinces us of the first, our finite intellects forbid the second.

We know then that creation is; we are a

part of it; it touches us, and we touch it; our senses manifest to us one set of objects, and our higher perceptions reveal to us another set, and these are the "things visible and invisible[a]." And the Nicene Fathers here declare to us, that God the Father is the "Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible;" adding also, when they come to treat of the Son of God, that by Him, the Father "made the worlds." Now their reason for asserting this was not only that due honour might be given to Him who formed them; (for indeed, in the words of Theodoret[b], "The beauty and the greatness that appear in the heavens are alone sufficient to declare the power of their Maker; for if on looking at a large and beautiful house we wonder at the builder, or seeing a well-built vessel we think of the shipwright, and as in looking at a picture the recollection of the painter is suggested to us; much more so does creation when beheld, lead those who view it to the Creator." Or, as St. Basil says[c], "The heavens declare the glory of God, not in that

[a] See Mr. Newman's Parochial Sermons: also new vol. Serm. v.

[b] In Ps. xix. Hom. i. p. 717.

[c] In Cap. v. &c.

they emit a voice audible to our perceptions, but in that the mind accustomed to reason on the construction of the world, and knowing the disposition of all things in heaven, by these as it were emitting a voice, is instructed in the greatness of His glory who made them;) but there existed at this time very various ideas with regard to the creation of the world. The old heathenism was breaking up, rotten to the core, and putrifying in its own abominations. Few believed the ancient cosmogonies, though they had preserved a good deal of the primæval truth. The old fables of Ouranos, and Ops, and Rhea, had ceased to have a hold on the people. The poet's work was over. Even Jupiter was clung to, more as the type and representative of a beautiful old system that was dying out, than as a real solution of the difficulty; but the intellect of man demanded some answer to the great question of creation. Some met the question by saying, that matter was eternal—that the world always had been and always would be. So said the Stoics; so said some of the Manichees. Others, such as Simon Magus, said that the world was begotten, and that by the operation of fire, as Theodoret tells us. "Fire with him was the

primeval parent Deity, infinite power. From this deity emanated his six Æons, male and female, and these with the original, the Spirit of God, which moved upon the face of the waters, made up the mystic number seven." Others, that it was made by angels; Menander, Carpocrates, Cerinthus, and many Gnostics, held this. Others, that it had been made by the Æons, or inferior Demiurgi, or Creators.

It was to meet these and similar errors that the Council declared their belief in God the Father, the Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. And we must not believe, that in the present day there is less need of such a declaration. It is true that the wild fancies of the early days of Christianity have died out, and the beautiful but deceptive theories of the Platonic schools no longer influence the mass of men; but are there not in modern science many theories against which the Nicæan dogma is a protest?

There are three classes of beings, to which God by communicating being has manifested His glory. The first of these are purely spiritual, as are the holy Angels: the second are purely corporeal, as are the material substances of which the universe is made up: the

last are mixed, consisting partly of spirit and partly of matter. Such is man.

Angels. With regard to the existence of the first of these, although we have no express declaration of their creation in the holy Scripture, yet we have constant allusions to them; and as their existence is a matter of pure revelation to us, it is enough to direct the reader's attention to the numerous passages in Holy Writ, where their presence and offices are alluded to. Rationalists deny their existence, and some branches of Calvinists assert that they have no duties to the sons of men; but both are so clearly written in the Bible, that they must have laid aside their reverence for the sacred volume, ere they have come to this conclusion; and beyond the words of Scripture, there is no method of proving their existence. The being and functions of the Angels, as well as their creation by God, is purely a matter of faith.

The world. Not a few of recent physical, geological, and astronomical speculations, have either in so many words, or by implication, attacked the true doctrine of the creation of the world. Unable to reconcile their peculiar theory with revelation, their authors have attacked its truth. The rationalists have gone so far as to style the

Mosaic records fables. Some have maintained a pure idealism, others a pure materialism, and a third party pure phænomenism; just as the ancients maintained the eternity of matter, the soul of the world, pantheism and dualism. Others again have maintained a theory of developement, that matter once determined towards being, has by an inevitable law advanced without any governing cause but the law of its being; that man is only the perfection of an inferior mammiferous animal, which in turn is connected as by a chain with a lower organism. Now by the world we mean that collection of finite and contingent existences, or the universe, which exists out of God. This Holy Scripture declares to have been made out of nothing: "In the beginning God *created* (made out of nothing) the heaven and the earth[d]." "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Thy hands[e]." "For He spake, and they were made; He commanded, and they were created[f]."

And truly even our reason demands that the world must have a Creator; for the world is finite, composed of finite parts: if it be finite it

[d] Gen. i. 1. [e] Ps. cii. 25. [f] Ps. xxxiii. 9.

must be contingent, mutable, and cannot have the cause of its being in itself: it must therefore have been determined towards being by some one distinct from itself, that is to say, by One omnipotent and eternal. Seeing there is life, it is most intelligible to suppose that life to be the work of God. Life is something more than the result of a combination of matter, and the natural account is, that it with matter must come from a living Power.

Mosaic cosmogony.

God's will is the only solution which we can apply to the difficulties of creation; but when we come to consider the matter in a teachable spirit, we shall see that the difficulties which the advance of science has raised up ought not to shake the faith of the devout Christian. And first of all, we should impress ourselves with a very profound sense of the present ignorance of man. Great as is the superiority of our knowledge, both in astronomy and geology, over that of our forefathers, we only know enough to convince us, that the scavans of the next century will probably look on us with the same pitying eye with which we should regard the adherents of the Ptolemaic theory. It is evident then that even if we can square our present views with God's truth, it is no

reason that further discoveries may not disturb our system. Now this thought is important, because it brings us to consider this; that in the question of the truth of the Mosaic Records, (on the supposition that they are not to be reconciled with modern geology,) the balance of probability lies between the truth of all Christianity, on the one hand, and of one theory of a confessedly imperfect science, on the other. The Mosaic account of the Creation is a part of the Bible, which we believe on the authority of the Church, from the witness of friends and enemies and from much internal evidence, to be one voice of God, speaking to His creatures; as such, it is identified with all Christianity, and therefore all Christianity must cohere or fail, as the Mosaic cosmogony does so. If the one be an error, the other is not God's truth. Now what does this amount to? it amounts to this, that the Mosaic cosmogony, being identified with a Christianity which has stood the assaults of nineteen centuries, been evidenced by martyrdom, been attacked by the scoffing infidel, and has ever conquered, comes to us with a force, which must necessarily, in every well-constituted mind, neutralize the effect which any one theory of geology or astronomy may tend to

produce to the destruction of the Christian Faith.

But while the Christian starts with the determination, "Let God be true, and every man a liar," he must not exact too much of the text of the Bible, or fancy that every thing is to be made clear to him. If the Bible were to solve every difficulty in science, man would need omniscience to understand it, and language that would suit one state of advance in learning, would be totally unintelligible to an earlier stage. The whole tenor of the Bible is practical; and even where it treats of matters not immediately referring to ourselves, it does so in a way that points to the relation of these things to us. For instance, we have no record of the creation of the Angels, though their existence is a matter (we may humbly suppose) quite as important in the Eyes of God as our own is; and when they are mentioned, it is either to allude to their care of us, or to stimulate us by their example to the continual praise of the Most High. Or again, when the history in an incidental way declares that God "made the stars also," it is for our sakes that it is said, that we might not fall into that error into which the heathens fell, that these bright

orbs were intelligences, and themselves creators and objects of worship.

Again, we must recollect that the Almighty, having ordained that man, unlike the brutes, whose instinct is the same from one generation to another, shall grow wise by the accretion of one intellect after another, it was necessary that whatever revelation was given to man, should be made in terms which should be intelligible to those to whom it was made; and even if the prevalent opinion on any subject were in course of time proved to be false, the first term would be the one naturally to be used. For instance, it would have been unnatural in Moses not to speak about the sun rising and the sun setting, though science now knows, that the revolution of the earth on its own axis is the reality of that term. We may take a case: suppose science were to establish that there is no such thing as substance and accident, yet the term homoūsion, or transubstantiation, (supposing the doctrine true,) would be the fittest word for describing the facts implied by the defective terms. When infinite intellect speaks to a finite one, there must be a certain adaptation and economy.

But while the devout Christian feels very

anxious not to shape the word of God to meet any theory of the day, however plausible or probable it may be; while he feels very certain, that God in revelation speaks the same language as the same God in nature, and therefore rather shrinks from theories which seem to make faith subservient to any empirical doctrine; he rejoices in the additional evidence afforded to fallen man of the greatness and goodness of the Creator, which all the sciences have furnished. If the thought of "the sweet influence of Pleiades," "the bands of Orion," and "Arcturus with his sons," was enough to raise the mind of the Arabian sage to the thought of Him who had ordained them; what emotions shall be excited in the mind of the modern, when he thinks of the millions of suns and systems which the discovery of Galileo has brought within his cognizance! If the general knowledge of trees, "from the cedar to the hyssop," placed the goodness of God before the eyes of the wisest of the sons of men, what shall be said of that beauteous science, which classes into genera, by "a law that cannot be broken," the different kinds of the fair flowers which carpet the earth, and finds evidence of supernatural wisdom in the mechanism of the

meanest weeds, which spring up as it were to mock the toil of man? And so geology, by revealing to man the mighty forces which have been at work upon the crust of the earth, the ages and ages which have passed since the first creation of matter, the wondrous adaptation of each sentient creation to the circumstances of the primæval earth in which it is found, and the gradual perfecting and ennobling of the works of God till the things of this earth are only a little lower than the angels, has surely a mighty power in increasing our idea of the greatness of Omnipotence, and of quickening our sense of the benevolence of the Supreme. The argument of natural religion is commended to us by the lips of our Maker Himself. "Consider the lilies how they grow;" and the same voice which said this to us in revelation, says now to us in science, Consider the foundations of the earth how they are laid; think upon the host of heaven how they are ordained, and gather, from the lessons you read there, arguments of my Power and of my Beneficence. "Thy Almighty hand, which is always one and the same, created angels in heaven and worms upon earth; not higher in those, not lower in these. For as no other hand could make an angel, so

neither could any other make a worm: as none else could create Heaven, so neither could any one else create the least leaf upon the tree; as none else could make a body, so neither can any one else make an hair black or white; but only Thine Almighty hand, to which all things are alike possible. For it is not more possible to Him to create a worm than an angel, nor more impossible to stretch out the heavens than a leaf[g]."

[g] S. Aug. Solil. 9.

V.

OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

AND IN ONE LORD JESUS CHRIST.

We have here three propositions. We are to believe in our Lord, we are to believe in Jesus, we are to believe in Christ.

Now the word Lord is attributed to the Three Persons in the adorable Trinity. "So the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy Ghost Lord. And yet there are not three Lords, but one Lord." *First*, the word Lord is attributed to God, and signifies the same thing. The terms were so convertible, that the Jews, who never dared out of reverence to pronounce the sacred name of God, Jehovah, substituted for it an equivalent term of Adonai, the Lord. And indeed, as Theodoret tells us, "The terms God and Lord signify the Divine Nature, rather than the distinction of Persons, but the words Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are indicative of separate personality."

[a] Quæst. 2. in Deut.

Secondly, The word Lord is applied to the Son of God. S. Greg. Naz. says[b], "Define our pious faith, teaching, that we acknowledge one unbegotten God, that is the Father, and one Begotten Lord, that is the Son, who indeed is called God when He is spoken of by Himself, but who is termed Lord when He is mentioned with the Father. The first term is given to Him on account of His Nature, the latter on account of there being one principle in the Deity, (μοναρχία.)

Thirdly, It is attributed to the Holy Spirit, as we see in the end of this Creed, "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord;" and, as St. Paul says, "The Lord is that Spirit." Œcumenius says[c], "The Spirit is Lord, and is of the same substance and claims the same worship as the Father and the Son."

Yet, generally speaking, in theological language, we apply the term 'Lord' to the Second Person in the Trinity, according to the words of St. Paul[d], "For to us there is but one God, the Father, of Whom are all things, and we in Him; and one *Lord* Jesus Christ, by Whom are all things, and we by Him[e]." "Wherefore I give you

[b] Orat. 28. p. 466. [c] 2 ad Cor. iii. [d] 1 Cor. viii. 6. [e] 1 Cor. xii. 3.

to understand, that no man speaking by the Spirit of God called Jesus accursed, and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." And when the first of these texts was quoted by the Arians against our Lord's divinity, they explained that the assertion of the unity was made against them that were not Gods, even the heathens', and not in contradistinction to the Son and the Spirit; nay, they said, that if the literal meaning were pressed, it would go to deny that God the Father was Lord, as a belief in one Lord was also asserted.

Now the Lordship of Christ over His creatures is twofold. First, He is Lord essentially. Secondly, He is Lord vicariously.

He is Lord *essentially*, inasmuch as He is God, and He has dominion from everlasting in common with the Father and the Spirit. Being of one substance and power with Them, He has the same relation to creation which They have.

He is Lord *vicariously*, inasmuch as He has been incarnate, and to Him in His incarnate Person has the kingdom of all worlds been entrusted. "All power is given unto me in heaven and earth;" or, as it is written in Ephes. i. 22. "and hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be the Head over all

things to the Church." It is in this sense that He is made Heir of all things, that is, as refers to the nature of man which He had taken.

The Name of Jesus.

We are to believe in Jesus. Not only did the Fathers of Nicæa feel desirous to embalm within their symbol the sweet Name of Jesus, which "is as unguent poured out," and "before which every knee doth bow of things in heaven and earth," but it was necessary, as it were, to fix the description of His power and attributes by a historical name. Authentic annals declared, that some three hundred years before, One had appeared among the sons of men, who had borne this Sacred Name, and to describe Him, and to assert the true doctrine respecting Him, was the duty and desire of the Church. Thus all Christianity, though it is not, as some men have asserted, a system merely exacting a belief in certain historical facts, does start with one such. It is here that supernatural faith meets and receives aid from the ordinary facts of evidence. It is here that History, as an handmaid, ministers to Theology.

Now the Jewish Scriptures had predicted that the Messiah was to come, and certain data were given as to the time and manner of His appearing. It was prophesied that "the

sceptre should not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh, or the Messiah, come[g]." That He should be cut off in threescore and two weeks, from a certain date given by the prophet, and certain political and religious events connected therewith are minutely described[h]. And, lastly, that He should come into a certain specified temple, His presence therein being heralded by a precursor[i].

All these conditions are fulfilled in the Lord Jesus. He came into the world at the time when the temple and the city were still standing, when the sceptre had departed from Judah, being grasped by Herod the Idumean. He appeared at the beginning of that last week, and in the midst of it suffered, whereupon the political and religious events, i. e. the cessation of the sacrifice, and the overthrow of the Aaronic Priesthood, as announced, actually took place.

And as the time and epoch of the Messiah corresponded with the coming of the Lord Jesus, so the circumstances of His sacred life accorded also with prophecy. First of all, He

[g] Gen. xlix. 8. [h] Dan. ix. 26. [i] Hagg. ii. 4. Mal. iii. 1.

was born of the tribe of Judah, as the two pedigrees of Him in St. Mark and St. Luke testify. Then He was born of a Virgin, according to the words of Isaiah, "Behold, a Virgin shall conceive and bear a Son[k];" and in the city of Bethlehem, as Micah had declared; "And thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, art the least among the cities of Judah, but out of thee shall come forth unto me that is to be Ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting[l]." Then He came lowly, as Zechariah[m] had foretold; a mighty worker of miracles, as Isaiah had predicted[n]; and the circumstances of His death and rising again, the manner of His entry into Jerusalem, the price of His betrayal, the companions of His punishment, the circumstances of His Passion, the peculiarities of His sepulture, were all declared in a manner so plain, yet so apparently undesigned, that no candid mind, admitting the genuineness of the prophecies and the authenticity of the history of our Lord, can fail to apply them to the same person.

The name of Christ.

We are to believe in Christ. Now the word

[k] Isaiah vii. 14. [l] Micah v. 2. [m] Zech. ix. 9.
[n] Isaiah xxxv. 6.

Christ, or Anointed, deriving its meanings from Him who is properly and actually so, is applied to many of those offices and conditions which shadowed forth His office[o].

First of all, there were the three offices of Prophet, Priest, and King, which, being typical of our Lord, were invested by unction. Thus Elijah anointed Elisha and Jehu, Moses anointed Aaron, &c.

Secondly, in subordination to the unction of Christ, it was applied to any one who had a mission from God, as foreshadowing His mission. "Thus saith the Lord to His anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him[p]."

Thirdly, As all men have in fact a mission into the world, to do God's will in their place, and as to do so requires the unction of the Holy Spirit, the expression is also applied to all Christians. "Touch not my christs, and do my prophets no harm." "But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and know all things[q]." "But the anointing which ye have received of Him abideth in you[r]."

But all these applications of the word are

[o] See Lactantius, lib. iv. c. 7. [p] Isaiah xlv. 1.
[q] 1 John ii. 20. [r] 1 John ii. 27.

only in derivation from "Christ," who is our Lord and God. Now the unction wherewith He was anointed was that "oil of gladness," wherewith God anointed Him above His fellows[s]. It was the various gifts of the Holy Spirit which were in all fulness poured upon the human nature of our Lord. "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power[t]." As He is termed the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, (that is, in anticipation,) so S. Cyril says that He was called "Christ, not because He was anointed by human hands, but because he was from eternity consecrated by the Father to be an High Priest over men[u]." And not as Priest only, for S. Greg. Nyssen tells us, that the name of Christ, if translated into a clearer and easier word, means 'King,' inasmuch as it is the use of the Holy Scripture to describe the Royal dignity by this term.

The word Christ is a name of person, (hypostasis,) not used in one way only, but indicative of His two natures. For He anointed Himself as God, anointing His body with His own Deity, and being anointed as man. For He is both the one and other, and

[s] Ps. xlv. 8. [t] Acts x. 31. [u] Catech. x.

the unction was that of the Deity on the Humanity. (Χρίσις δὲ ἡ θεότης τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος[x].) And the reason why the man Christ is said to have been anointed with the Holy Spirit is this, that the work whereby the Son of God united human nature to Himself, although common to the three Persons, is properly attributed to the Holy Spirit, whence He is said to have been conceived by the Holy Ghost. And since by that conception, and by the application of the Divinity, the man Christ was sanctified, rightly the unction of the Spirit, that is the grace and holiness of the human nature of Christ, is attributed to the same, who is believed to have formed it in the womb of the Virgin, and to have united it in one Person with the Word[y].

[x] Dam. Fid. Orth. 3. 3. [y] Petav. xi. 8. 5.

VI.

OF THE ONLY-BEGOTTEN.

THE ONLY-BEGOTTEN SON OF GOD.

THE human intellect, in speculating upon the Nature of God, could naturally conceive of Him as having a thought or reason; it could imagine Him contemplating Himself in Himself, and so forming an image of Himself[a]: it might have understood an exercise, both of the intellect and of the will, on the part of the Supreme; it could believe Him to utter a word; but it could never go so far as to invest that Thought, Reason, Image, or Word, with the attributes of distinct personality, or to connect intellect and will with the Son and the Spirit. Yet this is what the faith reveals to us. Under the old law, these are faintly alluded to. A peculiarity of expression hints to us, that the Wisdom and Power attri-

[a] One of the early Vedas introduces Brahm seeking for the image of Himself. Maurice Boyle Lect.

buted to God are something more than mere attributes. For instance, in the eighth chapter of the Proverbs, we find the Wisdom of God thus describing herself. "I wisdom dwell with prudence, and find out knowledge of witty inventions[b]." "Counsel is mine, and sound wisdom: I am understanding, I have strength. By me kings reign, and princes decree justice[c]." "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills, was I brought forth, while as yet He had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world. When He prepared the heavens, I was there: when He set a compass upon the face of the depth; when He established the clouds above; when He strengthened the fountains of the deep; when He gave to the sea His decree, that the waters should not pass His commandment; when He appointed the foundations of the earth; then I was by Him,

[b] Ver. 12. [c] Ver. 14.

as one brought up with Him: and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him; rejoicing in the habitable part of His earth, and my delights were with the sons of men[d]." And so in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which some commentators think to have been one of the earliest of the Epistles, we find the word of God in the same way invested with a quasi personality[e]. "For the word of God is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow; and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in His sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of Him with Whom we have to do." And so the mind of man, as it were, was prepared for the astounding fact, which it was reserved for St. John to declare, that "the Word was God."

The word uttered which we use is generated in and from the mind, and seems to be something else from that which is revolved in the mind, in so far as it is emitted from the mouth as from darkness into light. It is also in it, and similar to it in all things. For in speech is

[d] Prov. viii. 22. [e] Heb. iv. 12.

noted the thought of the heart, and again in the heart is recognised the word yet unuttered. So the Son of God inseparably proceeding from the Father, is the express image and figure of His property, (χαρακτήρ ἐστι καὶ ὁμοίωμα τῆς ἰδιότητος αὐτοῦ), being the living personal word of a living Father[f].

But besides the fact, which supernatural religion reveals to us, that the Word of God is a separate Person, we are further informed, that that divine Person has another relation to Him, in that He is His Son. And this is not a figure of speech, as if He had been adopted, but by a real, natural, but mysterious generation, the archetype of all sonship on earth. "He is called Son, not because produced in the way of adoption, but because naturally begotten[g]." He is called Son, because He is of one substance with the Father, and more than that, because He is from Him[h]." These two conditions being implied in sonship; first, that the Son is of the same kind with the Father: and secondly, that He is produced from Him. Indeed, from the appellation of Son, the orthodox Fathers drew a strong argument

[f] Cyril Alex. t. v. 47.
[g] S. Cyr. Cat. 10. §. 4.
[h] Naz. Orat. 30. p. 553.

against the Arians for the Consubstantiality of the Father and the Word; for they said, "We learn from the term 'Son,' that He partaketh of the nature (of the Father), not formed by a command (προστάγματι), but unintermittingly shining forth from His Substance, eternally united to the Father, equal in goodness, equal in power, the sharer of His glory[i]."

It is true, that in Scripture we find the word "sons of God" used in more senses than one. In Job i. 6. and xxxviii. 7. it is applied to the holy Angels. In Gen. vi. 2. if not to them, to the favoured race of Seth. In other places, to great men[k]. And in the New Testament, the faithful are described[l] as "born of God," and[m] "partakers of the Divine nature." Hence the Fathers did not hesitate to use the term Deification, to describe the eternal consummation of bliss, (θεωσὶν, ἀποθέωσιν, θεοποίησιν,) of the Saints. Damas. says[n], "God created man, that he might be deified by the approach to God:" and S. Athanasius[o], He (Christ) became Man, that we might be deified." And without venturing on such terms, we have the

[i] Confer Basil. Orat. de Fide, t. ii. p. 227. [k] Ps. lxxxii. 6. [l] John i. 13. [m] 2 Pet. i. 4. [n] Orth. Fid. 602. cap. 12. [o] Orat. de Incarn. c. 54.

word of Scripture for such expressions as 'being born of the Spirit[p],' whereby we mean, that in baptism we are transformed by the Spirit into a new creature, and become the sons of God by adoption. But all these terms of sons of God, and the like, merely point out to us that archetypal paternity and filiation, which they, as also all earthly relations of this kind, shadow forth. In the absolute sense God has only one Son, and therefore the Creed adds to this description, that He is "the Only-Begotten;" and St. John Damas. tells us[q], "He is called Only-Begotten, because He alone, in a way of His own, (μόνως,) is begotten by the Father alone: nor is any other generation likened to the generation of the Son of God; nor is there any other Son of God."

p John iii. 6. q Orth. Fid. lib. i. c. 9.

VII.

OF THE GENERATION OF THE SON.

BEGOTTEN OF THE FATHER BEFORE ALL WORLDS.

Of the eternal generation.

THE first draught of the Creed, as promulgated at Nicæa, was fuller than this. It was thus, "Begotten of the Father, that is, of the substance of the Father, before all worlds." There is perhaps no dogma of the faith more mysterious than this; and the holy men of old are ever warning us against letting our intellects exercise themselves on this, as it transcends the understanding of the very Angels of God. "Exercise not thy reason," says Nazianzen, "on the generation of God, for it is not safe. For even if thou knowest thine own generation, it followeth not that thou must know that of God. But if thine own be unknown to thee, how shall that of God be known to thee? For by how much God is more difficult to be searched out than man, by so much is the generation on

high more unfathomable than thine[a]." Elsewhere he says, "Let the generation of God be honoured by silence. It is a great thing for thee to have learnt that He has been begotten. But how, is not known either to the Angels or thee. How, the Father who begat, and the Son who was begotten, only know. All beyond this is hidden in a cloud, and transcends the dimness of our vision."

"Now as the not-being-begotten is the property of the Father, so the being-begotten is that of the Son; wherefore we must acknowledge one God the Father, without beginning (ἄναρχον) and without generation, one Son begotten of the Father, and one Holy Ghost deriving His substance from God, (ἐκ Θεοῦ τὴν ὕπαρξιν ἔχον,) yielding to the Father only in this, that He is not unbegotten, and to the Son that He is not begotten, but in every thing else, of one nature, power, glory, and majesty[b]."

Now the Fathers, while they assert the reality of this generation, desire to remove from it all earthly ideas; for be it recollected, that human generation is the reflex of the divine generation, not the divine of the human. Therefore they have taken care to guard it by such epithets

[a] Orat. 35. [b] Orat. 32.

as 'that which is celestial,' 'that which is beyond time,' 'that which is without body,' 'that which is unseen,' 'that which is without passion.' And especially with regard to the last of these, they appeal to the other description of the Son, the Logos. In order that we should not fall into human thoughts, and believe that the Maker of all things was born as we are, He is called the Word, teaching us that His Birth was free from all passion. For even the mind producing a thought, does so of itself, and suffers no division, and being perfect produces a perfect thought. Many of the Fathers press this simile upon us, taking care however to make us remember, that the thought or word here is something more than a mere accident of the mind, and therefore terming it the Substantial Personal Word, (ἐνούσιος, οὐσιώδης, ἐνυπόστατος.) Thus the eternity of the generation of the Son is established, for when was God without His Word?

Of Procession.

In the adorable Trinity there are two processions; (1) generation, and (2) procession simply so styled: there are also four relations, Paternity, Filiation, Active Spiration, and Passive Spiration. Scripture proves to us that there are two processions; that of the Son, as in

Ps. ii. 7. "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee;" and that of the Holy Spirit, as in John xv. 26. "The Spirit of Truth which proceedeth from the Father." The Father has no origin, but is the supreme Fountain of all other origins; wherefore He is termed by the Greeks, the Primal Cause, (αἰτία προκαταρκτική,) He is the unbegotten, the unproduced, the innascible.

These processions take place by what is termed the immanent action of God, subsisting in Himself, in opposition to the transient action of God, which terminates in the creature; and these immanent actions are to know and to will. Hence most theologians conclude, that the proximate principle of the processions is knowledge and will, so far as these properties are notional[d]. Thus, holy Scripture and the Church speak of the Son, as the word and wisdom, which regard the intellect; and of the Holy Spirit, as love, charity, and grace, which refer to the will. If then the Son be the adequate term of the Divine intellect, so as exhausting it, and the Spirit be the term of the Divine will as completing it, it follows, that there can be but two processions, as we have stated above.

[d] See definitions at p. 23, 24.

But if the question arise, why the procession of the Son is termed generation, and that of the Holy Spirit not so, it may be answered, that there is a difference in the mode of their originations, as indicated to us. For generation is the origin of a living existence from a living principle, one with it in nature, and it requires that the origin of the begotten shall be from the begetter by an action which communicates similarity; but procession is generally any emanation of one person from another, and the exercise of the will is to love one's like, not to produce likeness, it follows that the procession of the Word will be generation, but not that of the Spirit, who is love, and from the will[e]. But these things are mysteries beyond the ken of mortal man.

Of Properties, &c.

The properties of each Person in the Godhead are termed *notiones*. "Notio" is the character or mark, and distinguishing note, whereby each person is distinguished. Property, relation, and notion are one and the same thing. Five notiones are counted by theologians, Paternity, Filiation, Active Spiration, Passive Spiration, and Innascibility. And these relations and notions are true and real, otherwise

S. Thos. 1ma. 27. c. 4.

the Persons were not really distinguished; for if by nature they be one, they must be really three persons by reason of real relations, as the names imply. The names are not used as mere names without corresponding realities, but express accurately the proper hypostasis, and glory, and order, of each of those that are named[f].

Of Mission.

"Mission" is the procession of one person from another in order to an end. As regards procession, mission is eternal, immutable, and necessary: as regards the end, it may be temporal and contingent. Concerning both respects our Lord says, "If God were your Father, ye would love Me: for I proceeded forth and came from God: neither came I of Myself, but He sent Me[g]." Now the Father is never spoken of as sent, for He proceedeth from none.

[f] Creed of Lucian cit. Bull. [g] John viii. 12.

VIII.

OF THE DIVINITY OF THE SON OF GOD.

GOD OF GOD, LIGHT OF LIGHT, VERY GOD OF VERY GOD.

A HOLY Saint tells us, that the confession of the Divinity of the Son is the "Head of our hope;" and indeed it is that which really entitles a man to the name of Christian. It is the touchstone of faith, inasmuch as if that be admitted, all other admissions of the kind are easy. We at once leave the province of reason, and enter that of supernaturalism. It is the crown of charity; for "whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in Him, and he in God[a]." Wilfully to controvert this truth, renders one liable to damnation; for "whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father[b]."

A point so important as regarding man's salvation, so honourable from its divine Subject,

[a] 1 John iv. 15. [b] 1 John ii. 23.

so intimately connected with the whole history of the Church, well deserves our serious consideration; the more so, because, alas! the denial of the Son is not among the number of extinct heresies, but prevails fearfully in our own days. Indeed, the idolatry of intellect, and the dread of a belief in sacramental and supernatural graces, which so distinguishes the present time, make one have good grounds for fearing, that even among those who are not conscious to themselves of this deadly heresy, and who perhaps have never fixed their minds stedfastly on the thought, there exists a very vague and unsatisfactory state of mind on the subject; so that while they would shrink from denying the doctrine in so many words, they are startled by some of the consequences of it; as that the Blessed Virgin should be called the mother of God, or St. James and St. Jude, the brethren of God; or they are disturbed by certain texts of Scripture, which apparently assert the inferiority of the Son; or when they come to fix the mind closely and intently on the human actions of our Lord, His hungering and thirsting, and being weary, His growing in wisdom and stature, they are so unhinged, that they dare not look closely into that which

is the delight of the Catholic Christian, His perfect manhood, for fear of disturbing their vague faith in His divinity.

Hardly had Christianity been preached any where, before the devil began to sow the tares of false doctrine amid the good seed. Before the Apostles were dead, the Ebionites and Cerinthians had begun to teach that the Son was a mere man. Against these, St. Jerome tells us, that St. John wrote his Gospel. In the second century this error was renewed by Theodotus, who was for this reason excommunicated by Pope Victor. In the time of his successor Zephyrinus, Artemon repeated the same blasphemy. Sixty years after this, Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, embraced this error, and his sect carried it out to so full an extent, that they would not baptize in the name of the Trinity; wherefore one of the Canons of the Council of Nicæa desired, that converts from the Paulianists, as they were called, should be baptized. Then arose Arius, of whose history we shall treat more fully afterwards; merely stating now, that the sting of his heresy and of that of his followers, in spite of all their equivocal and possibly sincere expressions of honour to the sacred Person,

whom in fact they blasphemed, lay in their making Him a creature. How long Arianism after its condemnation secretly affected the Church, we know not, but from the close of the sixth century till the Reformation it does not attract the notice of the historian.

Now, though Unitarians have brought criticism to bear upon the sacred Scripture, and have endeavoured to overthrow the testimony of some of the strongest texts, there is the surest evidence in holy Scripture for this truth. In fact, if this can be explained away, any other dogma may be treated in the same way. **Direct Scriptural arguments.**

1. The first text we meet is, that "the Word was God[c]." Here we have predicated of the Word, 1. *Eternity*, "He was in the beginning." 2. *Distinction of person from the person of the Father*, "was *with* God." 3. *Divinity*, "was God." And, lastly, *creation*, "All things were made by Him." And this beginning of the Gospel of St. John receives weight from all the rest of it, which, coherent in connection with the truths here enumerated, becomes confused when disjoined from them.

For in ch. i. 18. the Son is called the "Only-Begotten of the Father." In ch. iii. 16. "the

[c] John i. 1.

only-begotten Son" of God. In ch. iii. 13. He is in heaven while He speaks on earth. In ch. v. 18. He calls God His Father, making Himself equal with God. In ch. vi. 40. and elsewhere, He claims to Himself the power of giving life. In ch. vi. 38. He says He came down from heaven. In ch. xvii. 8. and xvi. 27. that He came out from God. In ch. v. 23. that He claims the same honour as the Father. In ch. x. 30. that He is one with the Father. In ch. x. 38. that He is in the Father and the Father in Him. In ch. viii. 58. that He was older than Abraham. In ch. xvii. 5. that He was before the worlds. In ch. xiv. 6. He declares Himself the Way, the Truth, and the Life. In ch. ix. 38. He exacts faith in Himself as the Son of God. In ch. xi. 26. He allows Himself to be adored. And the scope of the whole Gospel is, that we might believe Him to be the Son of God[d].

And other Scriptures confirm this. Our Lord was condemned for blasphemy, because He said He was the Son of God[e]. St. Paul calls Him God's "*own* Son[f]:" "The Lord of glory[g]:" "The great God and our Saviour[h]."

[d] John xx. 35. [e] Matt. xxvi. 64. Mark xiv. 60. Luke xxii. 70. [f] Rom. viii. 3. [g] 1 Cor. ii. 8. [h] Tit. ii. 13.

"His Son[i]." "All things were made by Him, and without Him was not any thing made which was made." He does not say all things, but all things that were made, i. e. all creation. Hence it is evident, that He (the Word) was not made, by Whom all things were made. Therefore if He be not a creature, He is of one substance with the Father. For every substance that is not God is a creature, and every thing that is not a creature is God. And if the Son be not of one substance with the Father, then was His substance created; and if His substance were created, all things were not made by Him. But all things were made by Him, therefore He is of one substance with the Father, and therefore is not only God, but very God[j].

2. The next striking text is, "Of Whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever[k]."

3. "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know Him that is true; and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life[l]." The Son of God is essentially His own eternal life,

[i] Gal. iv. 4. [j] S. Aug. Trin. i. 6. 9. [k] Rom. ix. 8.
[l] 1 John v. 20.

and causally that of men and angels; for both is He the material of everlasting life as the object of divine contemplation, and also is He the cause of eternal life by virtue of the merits of His passion. And as He is the eternal life in heaven, so is He the eternal life on earth; "for this is life eternal, that they may know Thee the only true God, and Christ Jesus whom Thou hast sent[m]."

4. "And Thomas answered and said unto Him, My Lord and my God[n]." On this text Theophylact remarks[o], "He who had before been unbelieving, after touching the Lord's Body, shewed himself to be the best divine: for he asserted the twofold nature and one person of Christ; by saying, My Lord, the human nature; by saying, My God, the divine; and by joining them both, confessed that one and the same Person was God and Lord."

5. "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ[p]." He calls Christ the great God, to refute the blasphemy of heretics[q].

6. "But unto the Son He saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever[r]." By this He clearly

[m] John xvii. [n] John xx. 28. [o] Cat. Aur. in loc. [p] Tit. ii. 13. [q] Theod. ad loc. p. 706. t. iii. [r] Heb. i. 8.

shews that the angels have a created nature, the only-begotten Son, an incarnate and eternal one. By "thy throne," &c. as by "He sitteth at the right hand of the Majesty on high," He means according to His manhood. As God, He hath an eternal throne, without beginning or end, yet even here the things of man are conjoined[s].

7. "God was manifest in the flesh[t]." No figures fulfilled the mystery of our reconciliation, ordained from all eternity, because the Holy Spirit had not yet come over the Virgin, nor the power of the Highest overshadowed her, so that, Wisdom building herself a house within her undefiled womb, the Word was made flesh, and, the form of God being united in one person with the form of a servant, the Creator of time was born in time, and He by Whom all things were made, Himself was born amid all things[u].

8. "To feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own Blood[x]." This text is a most important one, as teaching what theologians have termed the "communicatio idiomatum," or communication of properties, whereby from the union of the natures of

[s] Theod. ad loc. p. 552. t. iii. [t] 1 Tim. iii. 16.
[u] S. Leo. Ep. 13. [x] Acts xx. 28.

God and man in the Person of God the Son, the properties of either in the concrete may be attributed to the other. Theophilus[y] says, "Since Christ composed of two natures is one hypostasis or person, the actions of man are said of the Word, and the actions of the Word are attributed to man."

That (nature) of which He was, He humbled; that which He was not, He assumed: not becoming two, but condescending to become one of the two. For either is God, both that which did assume and that which was assumed; two natures concurring in one (person), not two sons. Let not the union be denied[z].

Indirect Scriptural argument.

Besides these direct texts distinctly asserting the divinity of the Son, there is another class of them, viz. those which in the Old Testament are spoken of JEHOVAH, and in the New Testament are applied to Christ.

Thus, in Numb. xxi. 5, 6. the Lord is said to have been tempted by the Israelites in the desert; in reference to which St. Paul says[a], "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them tempted Him, and perished by serpents."

In Malachi it is written[b], "Behold, I will send

[y] In cap. 3. Joh. [z] Greg. Naz. Orat. 31. See also S. Leo, Ep. 10. 15. [a] 1 Cor. x. 9. [b] Mal. iii. 1.

my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before Me, saith the Lord of Hosts." Our Lord Himself interprets this passage of St. John the Baptist[c], His precursor, evidently shewing that He Himself is the Lord of Hosts, who thus spake by His prophet.

In Isaiah[d], the Lord of Hosts is said to be "for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both houses of Israel;" which is ascribed to Christ[e] our Lord in the New Testament.

In Ps. xcvii. 7. it is written of the true God of Israel, "All the Angels of God shall worship Him," and in Ps. cii. 26. "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, &c." which texts are quoted word for word in the beginning of the Hebrews, in proving the divinity of the Son.

We may gather a further argument for this result from the attributes which, existing in the Divine Nature, are applied to our Lord. e. g.

Eternity is a property which we cannot dissociate from our thoughts of the Deity; and we find it applied to our Lord, "In the beginning was the Word[f]." Immensity, and uncir-

[c] Matt. xi. 10. see also Mark i. 2. Luke vii. 27. [d] Is. viii. 13, 14, 15. [e] Luke ii. 34. cf. Rom. ix. 33. and 1 Pet. ii. 6. [f] John i. 1.

cumscription, and supralocal existence, are the qualities of the true God; yet our Lord claims these for Himself, in His conversation with Nicodemus[g]; "And no man hath ascended up to heaven but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven." From which we may infer, that while He was in the body, personally united to it, He was as God filling all things. Yet neither, on the one hand, did He come down from heaven as the Son of Man, because He brought not flesh from heaven, but took it of the Holy Virgin, of the same kind and substance as ours: nor, on the other hand, when He conversed with Nicodemus, was He bodily in heaven, but incorporeally, in that He was God filling entirely heaven and earth, and the regions above the heavens[h].

Omniscience is the attribute of God. "Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men[i]." "And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness[k]." It is His peculiar privilege to know all things, to be ignorant of nothing, either past, present, or to come. Yet we are told of our Lord[l], "Jesus did not commit Himself unto them, because He knew all."

[g] John iii. 13. [h] Severus Cat. in Johan. [i] Acts i. 24.
[k] Acts xv. 8. [l] John ii. 24.

Closely connected with this, may be reckoned the performance of such works by Christ as belong properly to God; such as creation, of which it is said, "By whom all things were made[m];" the preservation and continuance of that creation, of which He Himself said, "The Father worketh hitherto, and I work[n];" the performances of miracles, which extorted a confession of His divinity even in the days of His Flesh; and, lastly, salvation, with all the means to its attainment, remission of sin, regeneration, and the free gift of eternal life. "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature[p]." "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature[q]." "From whence we look also for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body, according to the working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto Himself[r]." "And this is the will of Him that sent Me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on Him may have eternal life, and I will raise Him up at the last day[s]." "And I give unto them eternal life,

[m] John i. 1. [n] 1 John xiii. 14. [o] Luke xii. 4. [p] 2 Cor. v. 17. [q] Gal. vi. 18. [r] Phil. iii. 20, 21. [s] John vi. 40.

and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand[t]."

There are two more epithets, which must not be passed over by us.

1. Since the glory and majesty of the Father, otherwise indefinable and invisible, shine forth in the Son of God, He is termed "the brightness of His glory[u]." And indeed no simile can more fully express to us the double relation of the Son, that He is at once in God and from God, than this, for "brightness is both from fire and in fire. It has fire for originating cause, (αἴτιον,) but is inseparable from it; for whence the fire, thence the brightness. If then it is possible in that which can be perceived by the senses, to be from something, and yet to exist in it, do not doubt, (the Apostle says,) that God the Word, the only-begotten Son of God, both is begotten as Son, and coexists with Him who begot Him as Word, which is the brightness of His glory. For from whence the glory, from thence the brightness; the glory is eternal, therefore the brightness is so also; and brightness is of the same nature as fire, therefore the Son is the same nature as the Father[x]."

[t] John x. 28. [u] Heb. i. 3. [x] Theodoret in Cap. 1. Heb. t. iii. p. 547.

The other epithet is "the express image of His Person[y]," with which we may compare "the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image of God[z]," and "who is the image of the invisible God[a]." All which passages are ratified by the words of our Saviour Himself, "He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father." Now the Greek word in the Bible, (ὑπόστασις,) may be rendered either essence (οὐσία) or person (πρόσωπον), and the expression has been taken by commentators in either way. Some hold that the Apostle means that our Lord is the express image of the Person of the Father, for each is the same in essence; but then it must be recollected, that the word was not yet applied to "person," and had not that acceptation in the heathen schools. Others held with more probability, that the Son is the figure and image of the substance of the Father, for that He so represents the Father, that the essence or nature of the Father shines forth most perfectly in Him. Nor does it follow that hereby the essence of the Father is different from the essence of the Son: for the Son represents the essence of the Father as it is in the Father, not as in Himself, although the essence of the Father and the

[y] Heb. i. 3. [z] 2 Cor. iv. 4. [a] Col. i. 15.

Son is the same. For the Son is both the figure of the essence of the Father, in as far as He most perfectly represents the Substance of the Father impressed on Himself by eternal generation, and has the same essence Himself[b].

"God of God." In this there are two propositions contained. 1. That our Lord is Θεὸς, God, i. e. of the Divine Nature; and 2. that He is ἐκ Θεοῦ, from God, that He is from the Father. Our Lord is one with, yet personally separate from, God. This is taught to us by the two descriptions of Him, the Word and the Son; the title Word marking His inseparable union with God, that of Son, His distinction. We get as it were a double idea of Him, as though He were so derived from the simple unity of God, as in no respect to be divided or extended from it, but to inhere within His mysterious individuality. We assert that He is "God," but we also assert that He is "of or from God." It is the clear declaration of Scripture, that the Son and the Spirit are the one God, and He in them. There is that remarkable passage which says, that the "Son is in the bosom of the Father;" and it is elsewhere said, that the Son is in the Father, and the Father in the Son[c].

[b] See Estius in loc. Heb. [c] John xiv. 4.

On the other hand, Scripture traces up the infinite perfections of the Son and the Spirit to one principle, to Him whose Son and Spirit they are, and the mind cannot rest till its conception with regard to them is referred to Him in whom they centre. The very structure of the Creeds, especially the Apostles' Creed, shews this. The title of God stands against the Father's name, while the Son and Spirit are introduced as proceeding from and abiding in the one eternal principle. The Nicene Creed, though directed against the impugners of the divinity of the Son and Spirit, observes the same rule even in a stricter form, beginning with the confession of the one God. Thus in worshipping one of the divine Persons, we worship the other also. In praying to the Father, we only arrive at the mysterious presence through the Son and Spirit: and in praying to the Son and Spirit, we are necessarily carried on to the source of the Godhead from which they are derived. St. Hippolytus says, "When I say that the Son is distinct from the Father, I do not speak of two Gods, but, as it were, light from light, and the stream from the fountain, and the ray from the sun[d]."

[d] See Newman's Arians.

"Light of Light." This expression very strongly asserts the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son, "for somewhere one of the saints said of God the Father, that God is light; and of the Son, that He is the true light. Here then the Father is light, and the Son is light, but true light is applied to the Son only. The Father then would not be the true light, since that is attributed by John to the Son only: but I think no one would be so mad as to hold this impious opinion. If therefore when the Son really is termed and is light, the Father is so also . . . where there is identity of nature, there there shall absolutely be consubstantiality[e]."

"Very God of Very God." It has been alleged, that some of the early Fathers use very vague language with regard to the divinity of the Son. This was natural, because until error rose on this subject, the faith was as much an instinct as a profession. Never having been doubted, it was never defined. Yet it is of importance, that we should see what can be alleged on this subject[f]. "1. It has been asserted,

[e] Cyril Alex. t. v. p. 74.

[f] See Petavius de Trin. l. i. c. 34. 5. Bulli Defens. Fid. Nic. p. 12. 13. 17.

that some of the Ante-Nicene Fathers held, that the Word was not from everlasting, but had been produced and begotten before other things, and had been used by God as a minister in the work of creation[g]. 2. Some of these and others were said to teach, that the Son was not perfectly Son till after the Incarnation; that He was modulum divinæ substantiæ, whose plenitude was in the Father alone. 3. Others asserted, that the Son was He who had appeared to the patriarchs, because He was neither incomprehensible nor invisible[h]."

In answer to these objections it may be said, that the Ante-Nicene Faith has been triumphantly vindicated by Bishop Bull, and that all that can be said is, that they were not sufficiently accurate in their terminology. Now with regard to the first difficulty it must be said, that the ancients distinguish three generations of the Word. 1. The eternal generation. 2. The external manifestation of the Word in creation. And, 3. The assumption of human nature. And it is to the

[g] Tertullian adv. Praxeam. Theoph. Ant. lib. ii. 19. Tatian. Orat. con. Græc. no. 5. Athenagoras in Apol. 10. Hippolytus de Antich. no. 30.

[h] Justin, Theophilus, and Tertullian.

second of these that the Fathers allude in the objected passages.

We must measure these Fathers by other passages in their works. Thus Tertullian, in the very same treatise whence the objection is taken, says, "The Word was always in the Father, as He said, 'I in the Father;' and was always with God, as it is written, 'and the Word was with God;' and was never separate from the Father or different from Him, for, 'I and the Father are one[i].'" Where He says, that the Son was perfectly begotten, when God said, Let there be light, applies to the second generation. S. Hippolytus says[k], that this was the sentiment of the Fathers quoted above, "seeing the Father had the Word in Himself, and was invisible in the created world, He made it visible, emitting His first voice, and generating, as it were, light from light."

Again, where S. Hippolytus speaks of the Son as being inferior to the Father, he means in the order of origin, not of nature. He merely alludes to that which the later Fathers call derivation. "When I call the Son another than the Father, (alium, not aliud,) I mean not two Gods, but light from light, water

[i] Cont. Prax. 8. [k] Contr. Hæres. Noet. c. 10.

from the fountain, a ray from the sun." So where they speak of the Son being "minister," subject to the Father, and begotten by the will and counsel of the Father, they mean that creation of the world which the Son wrought.

IX.

THE SON IS NOT A CREATURE.

BEGOTTEN, NOT MADE.

THE Arian heresy first appeared in Antioch. In that city, owing to political circumstances, the Jews were powerful; and even after Christianity had begun to assert its power, the influence of Jewish feeling was very considerable. Early in the third century, Lucian, a presbyter, had uttered language indicative of the same sentiments; and Paul of Samosata, as we have stated before, was Bishop of this See. The immediate cause of the outbreak of this heresy is as follows: Socrates[a] tells us, how that once when Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria[b], in the presence of his subject presbyters and the rest of the Clergy, spoke freely on the subject of the Holy Trinity, and asserted that

[a] Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 6.

[b] For some admirable arguments on the Arian controversy, see a letter of Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, in Socrates lib. i. c. 6.

"in the Unity there was a Trinity;" Arius, one of the presbyters of that Church, accused his Bishop of Sabellianism, and violently asserted, that if the Father begat the Son, He who was begotten had a beginning to His existence; whence it is manifest, that there was a time when the Son was not, and as a consequence, that He had His Person out of non-existence. In short, he asserted that our Lord was a creature. In this all the different shades of Arianism agreed, except perhaps those Semiarians, who while they rejected the word 'Consubstantial' as a new term in theology, taught in fact the true doctrine. All the rest fell into this capital error.

The real secret strength of Arianism was, that it was in fact rationalism. It was the popular religion of the day, supported by the influential and well-educated, defended by an unscrupulous but able logic, and exacting little of the obedience of faith. It was essentially plausible. It appealed to the letter of Scripture, from which it chiefly culled the following arguments.

1. Where our Lord is termed "the firstborn of every creature[c]," they maintained that this

[c] Col. i. 15.

implied that He also was a creature; whereas if we look at the context we find, that the whole spirit of the passage is against this interpretation, and that in fact it is merely an expression implying that He was begotten before all creatures.

2. They rested on a mistranslation of the 22d verse of the eighth chapter of Proverbs, which used to be rendered, "The Lord created Me in the beginning of His way;" which passage, while all the Fathers, except Eusebius the historian, agreed in applying it to the eternal wisdom of God, yet some applied it to His earthly birth, while others, such as Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and Basil, had the acuteness to find out the mistranslation of the original[d].

3. Another argument was from that mysterious text, where it is said[e], "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, *neither the Son*, but the Father." Now the real meaning of this text is, that as our Lord in addition to being perfect God was also perfect man, he assumed, in a way we know not, all the accidents of

[d] ἐκτήσατο for ἔκτισε.

[e] Mark xiii. 32. conf. Matt. xxiv. 36.

manhood, sin only excepted; it follows, that he therefore assumed that ignorance which is the lot of man. As man then, He could be ignorant of that which as God He must know. He came to be in all things like unto us, and therefore He came ignorant of the day of judgment as we are; but being the Word and Wisdom of God, He knew it. "If neither the truth can deceive, nor God the Word be ignorant of the day which He hath appointed, and in which He shall judge the world, as having the knowledge of the Father, whose image in all things alike He is, (it follows,) that the ignorance is not that of the Word of God, but of that form of a servant, which at that time knew so much as the indwelling Godhead revealed to it[e]."

4. The passage in St. Luke[f], where it is said, "Jesus increased in *stature and wisdom*, and in favour &c." supplied a fertile subject of attack upon the true doctrine. It was perhaps only fair to ask, How could the very Wisdom of God increase in wisdom? The answer is the same as that made to the last exception. "He did not increase as He was the Word, but as He

[e] Theodoret ad 4 Cyrill. Anathem. t. iv. p. 713. [f] Luke ii. 52.

was man, having a nature capable of doing so[g]." "The increase in stature and wisdom and favour is recorded in Scripture, in order to shew that our Lord was truly born of our substance, so that they might have no grounds for their error who assert, that instead of the real manifestation of God in the flesh, a mere phantasm, (δόκησιν,) had been begotten, which assumed the human form. Wherefore the Scripture does not hesitate to relate of Him the actions which are proper to our nature, such as eating, drinking, sleeping, being weary, bringing up, advance of bodily stature, increase: in short, all things whereby our nature is characterized, propension to sin only being excepted[h]."

5. The passage, "The Father is greater than I:" on this St. Augustine says[i], "Some things are so put in holy Scripture, to indicate the unity and equality of substance of the Father and the Son; as, 'I and my Father are one,' and, 'being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God,' and the like. There are other passages which describe Him as less, on account of 'the form of a servant,'

[g] Cyril. Alex. in Thesaur. Assert. 28. p. 240. [h] Greg. Nyss. ad Eustath. p. 658. [i] St. Aug. de Trin. ii. 13.

i. e. on account of His assuming the creature of a mutable and human substance, such as, 'the Father is greater than I,' and, 'the Father judgeth no man, but hath given all judgment to the Son.' Afterwards He adds, 'and hath given Him power to execute judgment, because He is the Son of Man.' Again, there are other passages, in which He is not shewn to be either less or equal, but only that He is of the Father; as, "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself;" and, "The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what he seeth the Father do." These passages are written because the life of the Son like that of the Father is incommutable, and yet He is of the Father: and the operation of the Father and the Son is inseparable, and yet the work of the Son is from Him, from Whom He is, i. e. the Father. And the Son so seeth the Father, inasmuch as thereby He is the Son[k]. For it is the same thing to be from the Father, i. e. to be born of the Father, as to see the Father: and it is the same thing to see Him working, as to work: but He does not work of Himself, for He is not of Himself, &c. We

[k] Ut quo eum videt hoc ipso sit Filius.

must hold this rule, that the Son is not inferior, save as He is from the Father; in which words no inequality, but only generation, is expressed."

X.

OF THE TERM CONSUBSTANTIAL.

BEING OF ONE SUBSTANCE WITH THE FATHER.

HAVING proceeded so far in considering the nature of the Son of God, the Creed now declares, that He is of one substance with the Father. The assertion of this became the test of orthodoxy, though it is quite true that some who shrunk from the term, were really sound upon the subject.

By the term Homoousion, we mean of one substance or essence; and when applied to the Son of God, we mean that the Son has been born of the substance of the Father, that in substance He is the same as the Father, no human idea regarding this ineffable truth being allowed to enter the mind. And the term is very valuable, as meeting both Arianism and Sabellianism; for as on the one hand it asserts that the Son is

consubstantial with the Father, so condemning Arianism, the very expression implies comparison with another, no person being able to be consubstantial with himself. Thus the confusion of persons which Sabellius taught is implicitly contradicted.

Though this term was first authorized at Nicæa, it had been used before. It occurs in several writers in the end of the second and beginning of the third century. But it had not passed into use without serious doubts as to its propriety; and at a Council at Antioch (A.D. 278.) was said to have been disapproved of in the sense that "substance" meant "person;" but afterwards when it was explained and men saw its value, it became the grand characteristic of true Catholicity[a]. The objection, sincere in some cases, that it was not a Scripture term, was used much by the Arians. In various of the Arian synods, such as Sirmium, Antioch under Constantius, and others, this was pressed. Yet the Fathers maintained, that though not in very words, it was substantially in Scripture, inasmuch as these holy records declare, that the Father is God, the Son is God, that there is but one God, implying therefore that

[a] Newman's Arians, p. 205.

the Father and the Son are one God, and consequently of one substance.

Error is always multiform, while truth is one. Accordingly we find the Arians split among themselves into various shades of opinion. Though we have before alluded to these things in our general account of Arianism under the last chapter, yet as we have here the symbol of orthodoxy, it may be well even at the risk of repetition to give a tabular view of the various watchwords of heresy.

Aetius and Eudoxius maintained, that He was (heterusius) of another substance.
Eunomius, disciple of Aetius, (anomoion) dissimilar.
Eusebius and the Semiarians, (homoiousion) of a similar substance.

These were divided into those who held,

Asterius, Eudoxius, Kat ousian homoion, (like as to being.)
Acacius, &c. (homoion,) similar.

But all shades of Arianism agreed in rejecting the term Homoousion, which embodied the truth, that the Father and the Son are consubstantial.

It has been objected, that the term Homoousion implies a specific, and not a numerical, consubstantiality; as Aristotle calls the stars of the same substance with each other, or as men are

of the same substance with men. But it must be recollected, that a word was necessary which could denote the Christian's idea, which was unknown to the heathen; and in the mouth of a Christian it can only have one sense. For Christians have never admitted three individual divine substances, so that the word consubstantial will endure no other sense than that of numerical unity in a substance existing in three Persons.

"When this term was used in relation to the incommunicable essence of God, there was obviously no abstraction possible in contemplating Him, who is above all comparison with His works. His nature is solitary, peculiar to Himself, and one; so that whatever was accounted to be of one substance with Him, was necessarily included in His individuality, by all who would avoid recurring to the vagueness of philosophy, and were cautious to distinguish between the incommunicable essence of Jehovah and all created intelligences. Hence the fitness of the term to denote without metaphor, the relation which the Logos bore in the orthodox creed to His eternal Father[b]."

[b] Newman's Arians, p. 204.

It ought to be mentioned, that some authors believe that the condemnation of the term at Antioch is supposititious. 1. Because it is not mentioned till the synod of Ancyra, in A. D. 368, 90 years after that of Antioch. 2. On account of the great silence of the Arians with regard to it. 3. That Eusebius does not mention it. 4. Because SS. Athanasius, Basil, and Hilary confess they had not seen the Acts of the Council. 5. Because Dionysius of Alexandria was accused before Dionysius of Rome for denying the Homoousion. 6. Because S. Pamphilus has used it. And, 7. Because the term was actually used in the Council.

XI.

OF THE WORK OF THE SON IN CREATION.

BY WHOM ALL THINGS WERE MADE.

HOLY Scripture is very distinct in referring creation to God the Son: "*By the Word* of the Lord were the heavens made[a]." "Who *by His excellent wisdom* made the heavens[b]." "By Him were all things made, and without Him was not any thing made which was made[c]." "For by Him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible[d]." "God, who created all things by Jesus Christ[e]." "By whom also He made the worlds[f]."

Neither must we regard the work of the Son as merely ministerial, for the Word always was in the Father, similar as to nature, participating in creation, and working along with

[a] Ps. xxxiii. 6. [b] Ps. cxxxvi. 5. [c] John i. 3.
[d] Col. i. 16. [e] Eph. iii. 9. [f] Heb. i. 2.

Him when that took place. "The expression, 'by Him,' in St. John's Gospel, is manifestly shewn not to refer to ministration, but to cooperation, and to be used in order that nothing may be excepted from His creation, in that he adds, 'And without Him was not any thing made which was made[g].'"

"And when he says, 'All things were made by Him,' we are not at all to suppose Him ministrative (ὑπουργὸς), and the servant of another will, so that He is not naturally to be considered a creator; but rather He alone, being the substantial Power of God the Father, as the only-begotten Son, does all these things, the Father and the Holy Spirit manifestly cooperating and coexisting with Him." Indeed, "when the Father worketh, the Son also shall work as His natural, essential, and hypostatic (ἐνυπόστατος) Power[h]."

"Yet the Son can do nothing of Himself, because He hath nothing different or foreign from the Father, but in all things is like unto Him; and as He has not another substance, so has He not another power or another operation; but because He has the same substance, therefore He has the same power, and

[g] Theodor. Mops. Cat. in Joh. [h] Cyril. Alex. in loc. Joh.

therefore He does the same things, and can do nothing but what the Father does. For He has no other power, either greater or less than the Father's, but there is one substance, power, and operation of the Father and the Son[i]."

This creation of the world by the Son is theologically termed to have been done *per appropriationem*, for both the Father and the Holy Spirit created all things, yet creation is peculiarly attributed to the Divine Wisdom.

St. Cyril of Alexandria[k]. "A. The divine Moses, said, 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth;' and mighty David, acknowledging a power not foreign to God, but in Him and from Him, that is, the Son, said, 'By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the Spirit of His mouth:' Is not, I pray, you the Word, who is from and in Him, personally distinguished from God the Father? B. He is indeed distinguished, for He subsists peculiarly (ἰδικῶς), though He be consubstantial. A. Seeing therefore the Father brought all things into being and established the heavens, how is the Word the Creator of them (δημιουργὸς)? Tell me, who desire to learn this. B.

[i] Theoph. ad loc. Joh. [k] Dial. vi. De Trin. vol. v. 618.

Willingly. But this disquisition is acute and subtle. The one nature of the Deity is known by us and by the holy Angels, in the holy and consubstantial Trinity. And the Father is in His own Person most perfect, as is the Son and the Spirit: for the creative energy of one of those just now named, in whatever thing it is exercised, is the efficacy of that One, yet it permeates all the Deity, and is the work (ἀποτέλεσμα) of the uncreated Substance, as if something in common, at the same time, that singly it is appropriated to each Person, so that through the three Persons it should be peculiarly fitted to Each, every one being complete in Itself. The Father therefore worketh, but by the Son in the Spirit. And the Son worketh as the Power of the Father, being understood according to His own existence to be in Him and from Him. And the Spirit worketh, for He is the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, the Maker of all things."

XII.

OF THE INCARNATION OF THE SON.

WHO FOR US MEN AND FOR OUR SALVATION CAME DOWN FROM HEAVEN, AND WAS INCARNATE OF THE HOLY GHOST AND THE VIRGIN MARY, AND WAS MADE MAN.

HITHERTO we have dwelt upon the original glory and nature of the Eternal Son: we now come to consider the adorable mystery of that humiliation, which for us men and for our salvation He underwent.

The Creed states, in the first place, that it was on our account that this took place, "for us men and for our salvation." It was not to save the Angels, but us, the younger brethren of creation, that He condescended to lower Himself. Man, who had been formed for the glory and honour of God, in His own Image, to reign in Heaven with Him after due trial on earth, had ill responded to His gracious Creator's intention, and in the sin of the first Adam

and in those of all succeeding generations, had frustrated the will of the Most High. Punishment, the just companion of sin, was due; the race which had commenced with so fair a promise, had failed to fulfil it; the very physical creation felt the effects of man's sin, and while the earth, originally pronounced very good by the lips of the Creator, began to yield a reluctant increase, the noble being who had been made a little lower than the Angels, endowed with free will, original righteousness, and all the beauties both of body and of soul, was the doomed victim of death, crippled in all the fair proportions of the soul, and the object of the wrath of God. But His compassions are unbounded; the very first sin called forth the wondrous scheme of its expiation; the fall was but the herald of the restoration. Dark was the hour for the human race when Adam sinned and Eve fell; but even then a light dispelled the gloom, and the promised Seed, Jesus the Son of Mary, was announced to our contrite parents. And as time went on, however lowering the clouds that hung over the destinies of mankind, this light never forsook them, but in obscure tradition or in deeper prophecy, in the solemn admonitions of the

seer, or in the cheering annunciations of the Psalmist, "The Lord went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, and by night in a pillar of fire to give them light." What then were the means whereby mankind was released? "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out." "The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance, so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men."

The incarnation is defined as "the hypostatic union of the Divine Person of the Son with human nature," or, what is the same, it is "the union of the nature of man with that of God in the one Person of the Word."

Now in approaching this awful subject, let

our thoughts be chastened, and our words few; that God should condescend to ordain this means of restoring the human race is very merciful, and that it is so, should be sufficient for us. We are not to speculate upon it, but to thank God for it, and to live as becomes those for whom so much has been done. But as the more we dwell upon it, the more we see its admirable fitness, and the more we meditate upon it, the more we come to comprehend the abyss of love in the heart of God, we shall not be doing wrong in putting before the devout Christian somewhat of that which the Fathers have said, regarding the means of man's salvation.

I. "It was becoming that our restitution to the rank and dignity of sons of God, should be effected by Him who is by nature the Son of God, and that the Image of God, in which we had been created and which had been defaced by sin, should be restored in Him and by Him, who is the express image of His Person[a]." "None else could renew the image of God in men, but the Image of God Himself, and none else could again make the mortal immortal, but He who is the Life itself, even our Lord Jesus

[a] Athan. de Incar. Verb.

Christ. . . . . For as, if a portrait becomes obliterated by filthy stains, it is necessary to have recourse to him whose picture it is, that the likeness may again be renewed on the same pannel; so the all-holy Son of the Father, being His likeness or image, came to us, that He might restore man made after His own image[a]."

II. It was becoming, that He who had in the beginning formed man, should be He that should reform Him. "It was fitting that the Creator and Maker should restore and renew His broken work. For though creation is attributed both to the Father and also to the Holy Ghost, yet Scripture every where bears witness, that by the Son all things were made. It was fitting that the Fashioner, when His work was spoilt, should take it again to Himself and restore it[b]." And Niceph. Bishop of Constantinople, in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, says, that it was fitting "that the Son and no other person should assume human flesh, that from the source whence in His infinite goodness we have received being, we should be vouchsafed well-being also."

III. God, being infinite Goodness itself, it is

[a] S. Athan. l. c. [b] Job. in Biblioth. Phot. cod. 222. p. 581.

natural that He should will to communicate Himself to His creatures; and though He could have restored the human race in many other ways, yet none appears so fitting as that communication of Himself in the incarnation of His Word. For whether we consider man's advance in faith, in hope, or love, this mystery most directly procures it. By it our faith is strengthened, inasmuch as the truth of God itself, being His Son, having assumed flesh, has constituted and founded our faith. And nothing could so raise our hope, as that God should shew how much He cares for us, by His own Son becoming partaker of our nature. And lastly, the coming of the Son of God has no greater cause than to shew how much He loves us. If we are slow to love, let us not be slow to love in return[d]." When the divine Word offered Himself to redeem man, it was within the power of Omnipotence to do it either by way of joy or by way of pain. But as He came not only to deliver us from eternal death, but also to draw to Himself all human hearts, He rejected the way of glory, and chose that of pain and lowliness; 'Who for the joy that was set before Him endured the Cross, de-

[d] S. Thos. Aq. 1a. 1. 2.

spising the shame. For greater love than this hath no man, than that he should lay down his life for his friends.' 'God so loved the world, that He sent His only-begotten Son.' S. Augustine says, "Christ came into the world, that men might learn how much God loved them."

IV. "It was becoming, that as sin entered into the world by man, by Man should enter the remedy also; and as by the pride of one man, who being man, sought to be God, we were lost; so by the humility of one other Man, who being the true God, condescended to become true man, we should be restored. And what could better pay our debts than the blood of the Son of God, and what better ennoble human nature than God becoming man? Who could better transact our affairs than the very Son of God, and who better plead our cause with the Almighty than the High Priest of the eternal Father? Who could better mediate between the discordant parties than He who is both God and man; as God and Judge, preserving the interests of justice; as man and advocate procuring mercy for men? As man He took upon Him our debts, making Himself liable and the principal debtor; and

with the Divine Treasure He paid to God, making use of the title of man to owe, and of God to pay." St. Leo says, 'Had He not been the true God, He could not have afforded the remedy: and had He not been true man, He could not have given the example. As true God He is the Redeemer, as true man our Master and Teacher.' He came indeed to ennoble us by taking our nature, to sanctify us by His righteousness, to enrich us by His grace, to teach us by His doctrine, to redeem us by His blood, to give us life by His death. And how could any better way be taken to shew us the fulness of God's goodness and mercy, and at the same time the severity of His justice, when it took so much to prevent sin and to pardon the sinner? How could any thing more clearly demonstrate the excellency of our souls, the power of grace, the greatness of glory, the beauty of truth, the foulness of sin, and the dignity of man redeemed at such a price? for the value of each of these things shews itself as measured by the excellence of the price of Christ our Redeemer."

Again, to cure the many and great wounds of our souls, what medicine could be as efficacious, and what better example could be afforded, to cheer us or to shame us into our

duty, than that of Him who is God and Man? What could better cure the pride of man, than the humility of God? What better conquer our avarice than His poverty, who being rich for our sakes became poor? What better reprove our anger, than the patience of God made man? What more entirely confound our disobedience, than the obedience of Christ unto death? What better shame the wrongs of the wantonness of our flesh, than the pains and austerities of His?

V. "The manifestation of the eternal Word in the flesh had the acknowledged end, to enable man to penetrate with undoubting certainty into religious truths." Divine truth is embodied in Jesus Christ, and it is in this sense that we thank God, that a fresh light of His glory has shone upon our eyes by the mystery of the Incarnation of the Word, so that from the actual sight of God in the flesh we are raised to the contemplation of things invisible. And this is what Dante means when he says,

> Matto e chi spera che la nostra ragione
> Possa trascorrer l' infinita via
> Che tiene una sustanzia in tre Persone
> State contenti umana gente al quia.

Che si potuto aveste vederi tutto
Mestier non era partorir Maria.

DANTE, Pur. iii. 33.

VI. The Incarnation of the Word took place to complete the spiritual marriage between Christ and the Church, to unite human nature by the most intimate tie of consubstantiality with the Creator. The Only-Begotten having shone upon us from the very essence of God the Father, and having in His own nature all which the Father has, became flesh according to the Scriptures, having, as it were, mingled Himself with our nature, through the ineffable concurrence and union with the Body which is from the earth. Thus He, by nature God, was truly called and became a heavenly man, not bearing God, as some say, who do not accurately understand the depth of the mystery, but being in One, God and Man, that having in a manner connected in Himself what by nature was far apart, and alien from all sameness of nature, He might make man to communicate in and partake of the Divine Nature. For the communication and abiding of the Spirit passed through to us also, having taken its beginning through Christ and in Christ first, as man, anointed and sanctified, though by nature God, as He appeared from the Father,

Himself with His own Spirit hallowing His own temple and the whole creation made by Him, and whatsoever admits of being hallowed[e]."

Errors touching the Incarnation.

Now, although in many heathen nations we find evident traces of the remains of the patriarchal belief in the Incarnation, notwithstanding that the evil imagination of man has in many instances made the traditions of it either grotesque or impure, yet so totally is this mystery above human comprehension, and so incapable is man of appreciating the depth of the love of God and the sinfulness of sin, that it was only to be expected that much secret unbelief, often evincing itself in the shape of positive heresy, should exist upon the subject. On the one hand, it was very difficult to believe that a poor man, occupied for the greater part of his life at a simple trade in an obscure village, was the great God who had made heaven and earth; and on the other hand, admitting that He was God, it was very difficult to attribute to Him all the weaknesses and accidents which a real participation in the nature of man necessarily implied. Accordingly, we find many endeavours of the human

[e] S. Cyr. in Joh.

mind to escape from the dilemma implied in these difficulties. Thus very early in the history of the Church do we find men, who, admitting more or less the facts of Christianity, endeavoured by a theory to accommodate these to their reason, instead of submitting their reason to the faith.

I. First of all, were the Gnostics and Docetæ, represented by Simon Magus, Menander, Valentinus, Marcion, Cerdo, Bardesanes, &c. who in so many words denied the manhood of Christ, maintaining that He appeared as man only in appearance, not that He was really born so. His manhood according to these was a phantastic illusion, not a reality, so that He was not really crucified, but merely the appearance of Him.

II. The next attempt of the human mind to escape from the difficulties of the faith, was that of Apollinaris, a presbyter of Laodicea, in the time of the Emperors Valens and Gratian. Dividing the invisible man into two, the irrational and rational soul, as we would say, the life and the soul, he denied that our Lord had assumed the rational soul, and maintained that the Word of God dwelling in Him stood in the place of it. This was met by arguments partly from the Holy

Scripture, partly from the necessity of the case. The orthodox quoted the text, "Father, into Thy hands I commend my Spirit," and, "He increased in wisdom;" and further maintained, that "as the cause of the Incarnation was the renewal of that nature which had been destroyed by sin; it was fitting that the whole nature should be assumed, that the whole might be cured; for He did not assume the nature of a body as a mere covering for His divinity, as the Arians and Eunomians madly assert, but He willed that the very nature which had been conquered should overcome the adversary, and carry off the victory. For this reason He took both a body and a reasonable soul[f]."

III. The next theory was that of Valentinus and his followers, who maintained that Christ was not in the substance of our bodies, but, bringing some sort of body from heaven, had passed through Mary without receiving ought from her. "They foolishly held, that the flesh united to the Word had not been compacted of the pure blood of the Virgin, but came down from somewhere on high." This heresy it will be observed is like Eutychianism, in that these maintained that the body of Christ was of one

[f] Theodoret.

substance with His deity. Apollinaris seems to have taught this error also.

IV. Apelles, a disciple of Marcion, maintained, that our Lord received an aerial and sidereal nature from the stars and substance of the higher world, formed from the elements.

V. While the authors of these foregoing heresies, though they acknowledged the supernatural fact of the Incarnation, required a theory concerning it to accommodate it to their reason, a coarser school met the difficulty by taking away the supernaturalism of the event altogether. The wicked Carpocrates, and before him Cerinthus and Ebion, maintained, that the Lord Jesus was the Son of Joseph and Mary, born as other men are. This is the blasphemy of the modern Socinians. The Fathers met it by maintaining, that the whole is a miracle, quoting the text, "Behold, a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son;" and they embalmed this truth in the appellation of ἀειπαρθένος, Ever-Virgin applied to Mary, or, as we more commonly say, the Virgin-Mother. S. Ambrose applies Ezek. xliv. 2. to this[g]: S. Chrysostom defends the interpretation of Is. vii. 14[h]: and S. Basil says, "The same woman is at once maid and mother,

[g] De Inst. Virg. c. viii. [h] Hom. V. on S. Matt.

remaining in the sanctity of virginity, yet sharing in the blessing of maternity[i]." To the same effect spake the General Council of Ephesus.

VI. They who held Sabellian views with regard to the Blessed Trinity, naturally carried out their false opinions into this other mystery, and maintained that the whole Trinity had assumed flesh. S. Fulgentius says[k], "The entire Trinity did not assume flesh, nor did the whole Trinity endure sufferings, nor did the whole Trinity lie in the tomb, nor did the whole Trinity descend into hell, or rise again the third day. This doctrine, falsely imputed to Catholics, belongs only to Sabellians, i. e. Patripassians."

VII. The Arians, though they attributed to the Word and Son alone the part of assuming flesh, yet they maintained that His divinity was both naturally and personally distinct from the Father's, as has been shewn before.

VIII. Eutyches and his followers taught, that though the two natures existed before their union, yet that after that, only one remained; either one left by the extinction of the other, or one, a third, formed by the union of the two.

[i] Hom. 25. cf. S. Aug. Serm. cx. clxxxiv. cxci. et passim.
[k] cont. Fastidiosum, c. ii.

IX. Nestorius and his sect taught, that the Word was not properly and substantially joined to the flesh, but only accidentally and relatively.

Of the hypostatic union of both natures in Christ.

It remains for us to consider the wonderful union of the two natures of Christ in one Person: and it is the more to be dwelt upon, because there exists a very great deal of latent error upon this subject at present among religious people. Now the union of the two natures in Christ is not a mere relative (σχετικὴ) union, as the Divine nature indwelling in the saints joins itself to their nature, but it is a natural, essential, personal union, in which the Divine nature has been wedded to human nature never to be divided. And so close is the conjunction, that by an ineffable mystery the two natures, each retaining their identity, but communicating their properties, make one Christ[1]. "For Christ hath two substances and natures, immutable and complete, the Godhead and the manhood, in one Person, perfect God and perfect man."

And in the reassertion of the truth, which the Church after much disturbance effected by means of that Spirit which was to guide the Apostles and their successors into all truth, we find that four truths were arrived at on this mysterious subject. The union of the two

[1] Athan. de Def. t. ii. p. 44.

natures in Christ was found to be, 1. indivisibly, ἀδιαιρέτως: 2. immutably, ἀτρέπτως: 3. unconfusedly, ἀσυγχύτως: 4. inseparably, ἀχωρίστως[m]. Our flesh, personally united to God the Word, was not changed into the substance of the Word, although it became the flesh of God; nor was the Word turned into flesh, although by dispensation He made it His own flesh. But Christ is called and is one, and the things *whereof and wherein* Christ is conceived of are preserved, unchangeably and inseparably, not one and another (person), God forbid, but one and the same: (ἀλλ' εἷς μὲν λέγεται καὶ ἔστι Χριστὸς, σώζεται δὲ ἀκαινοτομήτως, καὶ ἀχωρίστως, καὶ τὰ ἐξ ὧν καὶ ἐν οἷς νοεῖται Χριστὸς, οὐκ ἄλλος καὶ ἄλλος, μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλ' εἷς καὶ ὁ αὐτός)[n].

Following the holy Fathers, with one consent we confess one and the same Son, one Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead, the same perfect in manhood; truly God, truly man, with a reasonable soul and body; consubstantial with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the manhood; in all things like unto us, sin only excepted[o]. Saving the properties

[m] Concil. sub Menna. [n] Ephraem Theopolit. Pat. Bib. Phot. cod. 229. p. 796. ut Suic. [o] Conc. Chalc. par. 2. ad 5.

of either nature, and combined in one Person, humility was assumed by majesty, infirmity by power, mortality by eternity. For each nature retains its own nature without defect of its properties; and as the form of God taketh not away the form of a servant, so neither doth the form of a servant destroy that of God[p]. He assumed what is mine, that He might impart what is His; He assumed not to confuse, but to fulfil." The Greek formula of the truth of this doctrine is, that *ex quibus, in quibus, et quæ est Christus*, ἐξ ὧν, καὶ ἐν οἷς καὶ ἃ., referring to the two natures.

"Confessing our Lord Jesus Christ to be perfect God, we also assert that He is perfect man, and hath all things that the Father hath, except not-being-begotten (agennesia), and also all things that the first Adam hath, sin only excepted, that is, a body, a rational and an intellectual soul. Moreover, in accordance with these two natures, the twofold properties of these natures, two natural wills, a human and a divine will: and two natural energies or operations, a human and a divine operation: and two natural freedoms of will, a human and divine: and two wisdoms and know-

[p] S. Leo.

ledges, human and divine. For being consubstantial with God the Father, He wills and acts freely as God; and being consubstantial with us, He wills and acts freely as man. For whose are the miracles, his are the sufferings[q].

Of the parts of human natures assumed by the Word.

The Divine Word then is held to have assumed a true earthly body like unto our bodies. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same[r]." The human blood, which being necessary to the completeness of His inferior nature He took unto Himself also, became by its union of infinite nay supernatural merit. "The Blood of Jesus Christ the Son cleanseth from all sin[s]." He also assumed a human rational soul, which was united to the divinity by an immediate personal union, as were the body and the blood also. This implies that in Christ were two wills and two operations, but these never contradicted each other in Him. The sensitive appetite though it shrunk from pain, was yet in perfect subjection to the rational will, and that was in perfect conformity with the Divine will.

In assuming human nature, the Word had

[q] Dam. Orth. Fid. iii. 13. [r] Heb. ii. 14. [s] 1 John i. 7.

to assume the defects incident to it, such as the capacity of suffering hunger, thirst, pain. "Surely He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows[t]." These He assumed of His own will, to give us an example of virtue, to shew that He was true man, and to satisfy for us in every kind sorrow and pain. But He did not assume any personal defects, such as disease, nor any thing that could dishonour His Person; He did not assume concupiscence, or the first motions of sin. He was totally free from all sin whatsoever, as St. Peter says, "Who did no sin[u]." Indeed His human soul was impeccable: 1. because, from the beginning of its existence that human soul enjoyed the beatific sight of God, which dispels all the deceits of sin, and takes away the power of committing it. And, 2. on account of its hypostatic union with the Person of the Word, in which case if the soul of Christ had sinned, the Person of the Word would have communicated with sin.

Errors about the hypostatic union.

The two heresies, in opposition to which these mighty truths were evolved, were Nestorianism and Eutychianism. Both sprung up under the auspices of great names and solemn offices. Nestorius was Archbishop of Constan-

[t] Is. liii. 4. [u] 1 Pet. ii. 2.

tinople, Eutyches an Archimandrite of the same Church.

Nestorianism.

So prevalent were these heresies, that at one time Nestorianism and Eutychianism numbered more adherents than the Catholic Church[x]. It may be that the old opinion of the purity of spirit and malignity of matter, which gave rise to Manichæism as well as to the old Persian faith, may have tended to the spread of Nestorianism, which seemed to inculcate a somewhat similar principle, or at least a principle that may be traced to a similar feeling. Nestorius "cruelly rent Christ," by maintaining that He had two persons, one the person of the Son of God, and the other the person of the Son of Mary; that these persons were united accidentally; and consequently that Mary was not the mother of God, but of man. Of Nestorius, Photius writes, "Nestorius has not feared to divide and cut the one Lord Jesus Christ into two persons; the one mere man, existing in his proper person without the Word which assumed it, *προσλαβόντος*: the other God, *ἀνὰ μέρος, καὶ γυμνὸν τοῦ προσλήμματος*[x]." "He did not hold the union of the Word of God

[x] Gibbon, Dec. c. 47.

with man, but that there were two persons and a division[y]." Nay, it was only the just result of his views to say that he held "two separate natures, and two persons, and two christs, and two sons."

Of course, in this case he denied the true birth of Christ; and though when pressed he admitted that Mary might be called the Mother of Christ, yet it did not satisfy the Council; for though the expression, Mother of Christ, is a perfectly orthodox term, yet it was inadequate, inasmuch as it did not exclude the belief in the blasphemy we have just recorded, and therefore the Fathers of the Council decreed that she should be called Theotokos, Deipara, or Mother of God, "not as if the nature of the Word, or His Godhead, took their beginning from the holy Virgin, but because His holy body was born of her, and assumed a rational soul; and to this the Word being personally joined, He is said to be born according to the flesh[z].

Theotokos.

It is sad to think, that some modern divines of eminence in the Anglican Church should shrink from using this sacred term, commended

[y] Leontius de Sect. Bib. Patr. t. ix. p. 666. [z] Cyril. Alex. Act. Syn. Eph.

to them by the authoritative decree of a General Council, and eminently conservative of "the truth as it is in Jesus." But, "is there not a cause?" Who that is familiar with the books of devotion current among members of the Roman Obedience, can have failed to have been struck with the strong language used with regard to the present office of intercession of the blessed Virgin Mary? It is very painful to have to object, when one desires to be at one; it is melancholy for those who strive and pray for unity, to allude to a cause of unhappy division; and yet when one comes to read of her being immaculate in her conception, of her 'delegated omnipotency,' and similar expressions, can one wonder at any degree of reaction against such exaggeration? But is there not as much loss to the spiritual man, from a defect in dwelling upon her wondrous privileges, as there is danger from too highly exalting her? How few are there that can now say with the good old puritan Bishop Hall, "Blessed Mary, he does not honour thee too much who maketh not a goddess of thee:" and it is much to be feared, that an inadequate respect for the dignity of the Mother, too often results in an imperfect faith in the natures and person of her Son.

For Nestorianism is both historically and intellectually connected with Arianism. Although Nestorius was vehement against the Arianism of his own time, which had developed itself into its worst or Anomæan form, yet Diodorus and Theodore were both of the school of the martyr Lucian of Antioch; and it is remarkable, that its general prevalence was in Syria, where Arianism had been so extensively inculcated. Then intellectually Nestorianism was only prevented from being Arian, by the Church having accepted the Homoüsion; and therefore its misbelief, instead of fixing itself on the nature of God, attached itself to His Person. To assert that Christ is a mere man, though in words denied by Nestorius, is the just result of of his system: for to assert that Christ was man, joined to the Word of God by accident, comes much to the same end. The faith of the Church was well expressed in the Anathematisms of S. Cyril, who was the instrument raised up by God to subdue this heresy, as S. Athanasius had been to suffer and to conquer in the Arian times. As they are connected with the Council of Ephesus, and so are of great weight, we give them at length.

I. Whosoever confesseth not that Emmanuel

is God, and that therefore the holy Virgin is the Mother of God; for according to the flesh she brought forth the Word of God made flesh, as it is written, "The Word was made flesh;" let him be accursed.

II. Whosoever confesseth not, that the Word of God the Father is substantially united to flesh, and that there is one Christ with His own flesh, and He both God and man, let him be accursed.

III. Whosoever in the one Christ divideth the Substances after they have been joined, uniting them by connexion only, as if of the mere worth, dignity, and power of the flesh, and not by that union which comes from a natural union, let him be accursed.

IV. Whosoever divideth into two persons and hypostases those things which are contained in the works of the Apostles and Evangelists, and of the things that are said of Christ by the Saints or by Himself, apply some severally to the man beside the Word of God, and others, as if worthy of God, to the Word of God the Father alone, let him be accursed.

V. If any one dare to call Christ ἀνδρὰ θεοφόρον, a man bearing God (within him), and not God in truth as being one, and the Son by

nature, in respect of the fact that the Word was made flesh, and partook like us of flesh and blood, let him be accursed.

VI. If any one say that the Word of God the Father is the God or Lord of Christ, and doth not rather confess Him to be both God and man, for that the Word was made flesh, according to the Scriptures, let him be accursed.

VII. If any one say that the man Jesus was by the operation of the Word of God assisted, or was clothed with the glory of the Only-Begotten as being another beside Him, let him be accursed.

VIII. If any one dare to say that the assumed manhood is to be adored along with the Word of God, and together with God to be named such and glorified, as if different from Him, and does not with one worship adore Him as Emmanuel, granting Him the same glory, for that the Word was made flesh, let him be accursed.

IX. If any one say that the one Lord Jesus Christ was glorified by the Spirit; as if He used a virtue not his own, and received from It power over unclean spirits, and the gift of performing miracles before men, and doeth not rather confess, that the Spirit was His own by

whom He performed the divine signs, let him be accursed.

X. Holy Scripture relates, that Christ has been made our High Priest, and the Apostle of our faith. And that He offered Himself for us, an offering to God for a sweet smelling savour. If therefore any one say that the Word of God did not become our High Priest and Apostle, when the Word was made flesh and man for us men; but man born of a woman was so, as one beside Him, severally: or if any one say, that He offered His offering for Himself too and not rather for us only, seeing that He needed no oblation who had no sin, let him be accursed.

XI. If any one confesseth not, that the flesh of the Lord is lifegiving and belonging to the very Word of God the Father, but asserts that it is of another beside Him, joined to Him in a union of dignity, and as a habitation of the divinity, and that it is not lifegiving, inasmuch as it is the property of the Word which hath power to give life unto all things, let him be accursed.

XII. If any one confesseth not that the Word of God suffered in the flesh, was crucified in the flesh, tasted death in the flesh, and became the first-born from the dead, because

He is the Life and the Lifegiver as God, let him be accursed[a].

XIII. There is a full definition of the Catholic doctrine on this subject in a letter of S. Cyril to Nestorius, approved by the Council of Ephesus[b].

Adoptianism.

A reproduction of the Nestorian heresy took place in the ninth century in Adoptianism, a mistake fostered by Felix and Elipandus in Spain. These distinguished in Christ two sons by reason of the double nature, one the Son of God by nature, the other the Son of God by adoption and grace. Against this the Church taught, that Christ is naturally, and not by adoption, the Son of God. This error was condemned by the Council of Frankfort, A.D. 794.

Importance of a correct faith on these points.

Now independently of the absolute sacredness of all God's truth, it must be borne in mind, that there is no truth so important as that which concerns the Natures and Person of Christ. "The Son of God our Redeemer is a distinct Being: He is what He is, and none other, eternally like unto Himself, constantly one and the same. Not in vain do

[a] See Petavius de Incarn. lib. vi. 16, 17.

[b] Conc. Eph. Pars i. cap. viii. Labbe, t. iii. 318. and Conc. Chalc. Act. i. t. iv. 159. It is given by Carranza as Can. xiii. of Ephesus, after the xii. Anathemas.

the Holy Scriptures connect all this with *His Person:* the more they do this, the more important is it to conceive of Him exactly as He really was (is). Certain it is, that every error, in relation to His Person, exercises a more or less injurious effect on the piety and virtue of its possessors: whereas a right knowledge of His Person forms the surest and most solid basis of a holy and happy life[b]."

The tendency to a secret Nestorianism in the present day, besides the shrinking from giving due honour to her whom all generations call blessed, shews itself in this: "there is a peculiar spirit arising from an infirm grasp of our Lord's divine personality, which leads men to speak of His human actions in a painfully familiar way, as if they were the actions of a man, as any other men, and not of God made man." We find commendations passed upon His conduct, and epithets implying our approval of Him, applied to Him Who is the great God of heaven and earth. We have speculations as to His motives, and an irreverent judgment upon His actions, which is very revolting. Another phase of this is, that practical Apollinarianism, which while it acknowledges the divinity of the Son, cannot bear the thought of the

[b] Möhler.

details of His human actions, and can hardly face the individualization of every act of the sacred manhood; thus they form, as it were, two conceptions of the second Person of the Trinity, allowing each to dwell in the mind as it were at different times, and so practically believing in two Persons.

Eutychianism.

The opposite error to this is that of the Eutychians, otherwise called Jacobites, Acephali, or Monophysites. Nestorius, as we have seen, having observed in Christ two natures, fancied that they were two persons. Eutyches, on the other hand, recognising one person, imagined there was but one nature. "Our one Lord Jesus Christ, acknowledged in His divine and human nature, and worshipped in both, they most audaciously and stupidly mingled and confused into one nature." This implied that His human nature was a phantasm. The absurdities which this view imply are well shewn forth by Photius[c]. "If there be one nature in Christ, it is either the divine or the human nature: if it be only the divine nature, where is the human? and if there be only the human, you cannot escape from denying the divine. But if it be something different

[c] Ep. i. Cont. Eutych. cit. Suic.

from these, (for this is the only other alternative they have, and they seem to lean that way,) how shall not in that case Christ be of a different nature, both from His Father and from us? Can any thing be more impious or absurd to say that the Word of God, who is God, became man, to the corruption of His own Deity, and to the annihilation of the humanity He assumed? For this absolutely follows with those who have dared to speak of Christ as of neither nature, but of one besides these."

"The two natures were without conversion or alteration joined together, and the divine nature did not depart from its own simplicity, nor did the nature of man turn into the nature of God, nor was it deprived of existence, nor was one composite nature made out of two. For a composite nature cannot be consubstantial with either of those natures from whence it is compounded. If therefore, according to the heretics, Christ exist, in one compounded nature after the union, He is changed from a simple into a compounded nature, and is not consubstantial with His Father, who is of a simple nature, nor with His mother, for she is not made up of the Godhead and manhood. And He will be neither in the Godhead nor in the

manhood, nor will He be called God or man, but Christ only; and Christ will be the name not of His person, but of His one nature, as they deem. But we do not hold Christ to be of a composite nature, as the body and soul make the man, but we believe and confess that He is of the Godhead and manhood, perfect God and perfect man, from and in two natures. Were He of one nature, the same nature would be at once created and increate, simple and composite, mortal and immortal. And the union of the two natures in Jesus Christ has taken place, neither by disorder (φυρμός) nor by confusion, nor by mixture, (syncrasis or anacrasis,) as Eutyches, Dioscorus (of Alexandria), and Severus say; neither is it personal (προσωπικόν) nor relative, nor κατ' ἀξίαν, nor from identity of will, nor from equality of honour, nor from the same name, as Nestorius, Diodorus (of Tarsus), and Theodorus (of Mopsuestia), said; but by synthesis; or personally, (καθ' ὑπόστασιν,) immutably, inconfusedly, unalterably, inherently, inseparably, in two perfect natures in one person. And we term this union essential (οὐσιώδη), that is, true and not phantastic; essential, not in that one nature is made of the two, but that they are mutually united in truth

into one composite Person of the Son of God. And their substantial differences are preserved, for that which is created remains created, and that which is increate remains increate; the mortal remains mortal, the immortal abides immortal. The one shines forth in miracles, the other submits to injuries; and the Word appropriates to Itself that which is of man. For Its are the things that pertain to the Sacred Flesh, and It gives its own properties to the flesh, according to the law of the communication of properties and the unity of person, for He is the same who performs both the God-like and the man-like actions in either form with the communion of the other. Wherefore the Lord of glory is said to be crucified, although the Divine Nature did not suffer, and the Son of man, even before His Passion, is confessed to be in heaven, as the Lord Himself said[d]. For there is one and the same Lord of glory, who is naturally and in truth the Son of man, that is, made man. We acknowledge both His miracles and His sufferings, though the first were performed according to one nature, the latter endured according to the other. Thus we know that His one person and His two natures are

[d] John iii.

preserved. By the difference of the natures He is, on the one hand, one with the Father and the Holy Ghost; on the other hand, He is one with His mother and with us. And these two natures are joined in one composite person, in which He differs as from the Father and the Holy Ghost, so from His mother and us also[e].

Now we have all a great tendency to Eutychianism. It gets over a great difficulty in the reception of truth to believe the humanity of our Lord destroyed. For faith now requires of us to believe that the human body of Jesus Christ still *is*, and that to It the Word is hypostatically joined, and that beyond the spheres and systems of which we are cognizant, It, partaking of our nature, is at the right hand of God. This of course is a great trial to the faith. But there is much connected with it. A true belief with regard to the Resurrection, and an orthodox faith in the Blessed Sacrament, both depend upon our escaping a tendency to Eutychianism. Yet "it were blasphemy to assert that He had destroyed that body, which being a real body, He condescended to take on Him and to speak from when on earth, in which also He will

[e] S. Joh. Dam. Fid. Orth. iii. 3. (abridged.)

judge us at the last day; and to it He will liken the bodies of His saints, according to the mighty working whereby He is able to subdue all things to Himself; and it is through the thought of the eternity of Christ's body now in heaven, that our flesh is able to rest in hope, trusting that we shall see Him at the last day," as will they also that pierced Him[f]."

Monothelitism.

As Adoptianism is a reproduction of Nestorianism, so Monothelitism is a consequence of the Monophysite error. Anastasius, patriarch of the Jacobites, supported by Sergius of Constantinople and Cyril of Photis, advocated it: Sophronius, Archbishop of Jerusalem, opposed it, and Pope Honorius was led by false representations to give this error the sanction of his name. It was however promptly condemned in the Lateran Council, held under S. Martin in A.D. 649, and in the sixth General Council of Constantinople, A.D. 680, in the reign of Constantine Pogonatus. The Monothelites acknowledged only one will and operation in our Lord Jesus Christ after the union of the divine and human natures. This necessarily destroyed the perfection of His human nature, which was thereby deprived of will and ope-

[f] Morris, Prize Essay, p. 368.

ration, and it was impossible to maintain this doctrine, and assert that our Lord was very man.

Of the two operations and wills in Christ.

Holy Scripture evidently shews, that there were two operations in Christ, wherever they record His life. They exhibit our Lord uttering prophecies, and performing miracles, which are the fruit of the Divine power only, and the proofs of its manifestation. They reveal Him, walking, speaking, refreshing Himself with food and drink, hungering, thirsting, being weary, rejoicing, sorrowing, weeping, suffering, wounded, dying, all which things are human, and ordained to demonstrate His humanity. Hence there is a double operation in Him. And hence as will is an operation of the mind, there must be also a divine and a human will, which is further proved from the sacred records. All who believe in His divinity admit He had a divine will, one with the Father's will; but we further see He had a human will, not adverse but always subservient to the divine will, yet distinct from it, and so far as a perfectly innocent will can be different from the divine will, different from it: as, 'Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me; nevertheless not My will but Thine be done, (not as I will

but as Thou wilt[f].') 'I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me[g].' The human will of our Lord is also referred to in the Gospels[h].

Operation being the substantial motion of the nature and its essential note, (for a nature cannot be conceived without its operation,) it follows that there must be in Christ as many operations as natures. And these are two. So again, if the operation and will in Christ were only one, it must be either simple or composite: if simple, then it must be either divine or human: if divine, Christ were not man; if human, He were not God. On the other hand, if the nature be held to be composite, the will and operate would be composite also, that is, created and increate, finite and infinite, which is impossible.

Of the communicatio idiomatum.

One consequence of the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ has already been alluded to in Section VIII[i]. viz. the communication of their respective properties. It is termed by the Greeks antidosis (and also perichoresis), and we understand by it, that by which either nature and the properties of

[f] Cf. Matt. xxvi. 39. Mark xiv. 36. with Luke xxii. 42.
[g] John vi. 38. [h] In Mark vi. 48. vii. 24. Matt. xxvii. 34.
[i] p. 143.

either nature are so spoken of Christ, that what is human is applied to God, and what is divine to man. It is necessary that this should be carefully considered, as a neglect of it may plunge us either into Eutychianism or Nestorianism. The great rule to be observed is, that the things which are mutually predicated of the two natures shall be referred to His Person; in other words, they must be spoken in the concrete and not in the abstract.

Now that the communication of properties is in the concrete is clear, both from the Holy Scriptures and from the Creeds; where, of one and the same Christ it is said, that He is God, and that He suffered and died. "On account of the union of the flesh assumed, and the divinity which assumed it, the names are mutually changed, and what is human is attributed to the divine, what is divine to the human[i]." Our Lord[j] calls Himself the Son of Man, who[k] is declared to be in heaven, which at that moment He was not as man, but only as God: and St. Paul speaks of the Jews[l] as crucifying the Lord of glory.

But this is not true in the abstract. The

[i] Greg. Nyss. adv. Apoll. t. 2. [j] Matt. ix. 6.
[k] John iii. 13. [l] 1 Cor. ii. 8.

Lutherans, to make out their rationalistic theory of the Real Presence, have imagined the ubiquity or omnipresence of Christ's manhood. This comes near Eutychianism. Therefore we may say, God, or the Son of God, died for us, but we may not say, the Godhead died for us. We may say God is man, the Son of God is the Son of man, and we may say that the Eternal One was born in time or that the Impassible One suffered, but we may not say Impassibility suffered, or that the Deity died. There are a few expressions, which though justifiable as a consequence of this truth, and capable of being taken in an orthodox sense, are nevertheless to be avoided; e. g. "Christ is less than the Father," on account of the Arians, unless we add, "according to His manhood;" or "Christ is a Godbearing man" (θεόφορος), on account of the Apollinarians, and the like.

XIII.

OF THE PASSION, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION.

AND WAS CRUCIFIED ALSO FOR US UNDER PONTIUS PILATE; HE SUFFERED AND WAS BURIED, AND THE THIRD DAY HE ROSE AGAIN ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES.

The Cross.

THE last article which we have considered is surely enough to warm the coldest heart; that the great God of heaven and earth should, out of pure love for us His erring creatures, descend from His essential dignity, abandon His inherent happiness, and take on Him the form of a slave; that not content with exercising an hourly care of His creation, and leading His people as by the hand, that He should deign to become part and portion of that creation, to renew it, and to restore to man that happiness and that paradise that he had forfeited by sin; is a thought that should make the Christian's heart burn within him; but the wonder of goodness

and miracle of mercy is not yet completed; we have to contemplate the Son of God not only in humiliation, but in suffering; not only in creation, but in pain; not only in the form of a servant, but obedient unto death. And what a death! They who have studied such things, and have made the agonies that accompany the separation of the soul from the body the object of their enquiries, tell us, that the cup which the Captain of our salvation had to drain to the dregs, is the bitterest that can be offered to the sons of men: and if to this physical fact we add the thought, that our Lord in taking to Himself human nature, took it in its perfection, every nerve and sinew doing its appointed work, we may conceive that the capacity for suffering was there in its perfection also. And who can conceive the abyss of sorrow and of love within His sacred heart, the agonies of mind and the unspeakable sufferings which the expiation of our sins entailed upon Him. By thine unknown sufferings, good Lord, deliver us!

But it was not only that the Cross was the cruellest death by which man could die, that the Son of God hung thereon. Every thought of shame and ignominy that could attach to the

death of the vilest malefactor, was associated with the gibbet of the Cross. It was the punishment of the refuse of mankind, and the earliest sentiment of unenlightened civilization had shrunk in horror from the thought of it. Nay, the voice of God Himself had condemned it, saying, Cursed is he that hangeth on a tree. And so He who came to be a curse for us, who came to bear the shame, and the penance, and the remorse, and the malediction which our sins had occasioned, did not refuse to bear it even to this death.

Strange was it that the uninspired reason of man should fix on this as the reward of perfect virtue; yet one, wiser than any child of earth, save him to whom the Lord gave wisdom as a gift, when saying what would be the fate of a perfectly good man on earth, pronounced the very fate which happened to our Lord; "He shall be scourged, He shall be tormented, He shall be bound, He shall have his eyes burnt out, and after suffering every evil, He shall be crucified at a stake[a]."

Yet there was a peculiar fitness in the circumstances of the Passion, which endeared them, awful though they were, to the reverent

[a] Plato, Rep. ii. p. 361. E.

recollection of the Christian, for those sufferings which the heathen soldiery inflicted are our life, and His sorrows are our joy. It was seen, that, raised from the earth, He fulfilled the type of the healing serpent; it was seen, that, according to His own words, when lifted up He drew all men to Him; it was seen, that on the Cross He stretched out His hands all the day long to a gainsaying and rebellious people; it was seen, that as by the fruit of one tree sin had entered into the world, so by another tree the curse was taken away.

And such is the feeling of the Christian now. Eighteen hundred years of reverent admiration have divested the Cross of every lowering thought. That which formerly bore the worst of men, now glitters in the diadem of kings. It is the sign of the Christian's hope, it is the earnest of His triumph. Lowly reverenced without, patiently borne within, it is the transforming power whereby the spirit of the world is changed within us into the Spirit of Christ. Hear what the Fathers say concerning it. "The Cross is our trophy over the devil, the sword of sin, the weapon wherewith Christ stung the serpent. The Cross is the will of the Father, the glory of

the Only-Begotten, the joy of the Spirit, the ornament of Angels, the safety of the Church, the glory of Paul, the fortress of the saints, and the light of the whole world[b]." Or again, "The Cross is the head of our hope, the cause of infinite blessings. By it we, who before this were dishonoured and disinherited, have been restored to the relation of sons: by it we no more wander, but know the truth: by it we, who formerly worshipped wood and stone, recognise the Maker of all things: by it we, who were the slaves of sin, are brought into the liberty of righteousness: by it the very earth has become heaven. This has freed us from error, led us to truth, reconciled God and man, raised us from the depths of sin, lifted us to the height of virtue, destroyed the seductions of the devil, and overthrown deceit[c]." Or hear how the Latin Church sings in Passiontide.

Crux fidelis inter omnes,
  Arbor una nobilis:
Silva talem nulla profert,
  Fronde, flore, germine,
Dulce ferrum, dulce lignum,
  Dulce Pondus sustinent.

[b] Chrys. Hom. 81. Sav. t. v. [c] Hom. 83. ib.

And if this be so, is it to be wondered that gentle and thoughtful minds should have remarked in loving contemplation, how many things in nature are marked with the Cross? how the patient beast, whereon our Master rode in the solitary hour of His triumph, the outstretched wings of birds, the yards of ships, the branches of trees, and many other things, bear this sacred impress? It is said, that cruciform plants are never poisonous. We have on record the aweful joy with which the first mariners, who penetrated to the south, hailed the constellation of the Cross, as it rose over the stormy sea; and they who in early years have been exiled to the lands whereon it shines, or who have ploughed the halcyon ocean beneath its beams, can still speak of the holy calm which it inspired, and of the elevating thoughts which it suggested.

Theological reasons for the death of our Lord.

Now, if we consider the theological reasons why it became our Lord to die for us, we come to this truth, that He has really and actually satisfied the justice of God for us. It is evident, 1. That no created thing was able or fit to satisfy God, either for original or actual sin, and therefore none but He who was God could intervene. 2. The satisfaction of

our Lord being His, the action of the incarnate Word, it is therefore an infinite satisfaction, far exceeding what was necessary to destroy all sin. And the way in which this has taken place is fourfold. 1. As our High Priest, He offered Himself as a victim of expiation. 2. As our Sponsor or Surety, He took upon Him all our sins. 3. He redeemed us by His Blood. 4. As our Mediator, He has reconciled us to God.

I. Our Lord from the moment of His incarnation was a Priest, not of the order of Levi, but of that of Melchizedek; as David clearly foreshewed[d], "Thou art a Priest for ever;" which passage is commented upon by St. Paul[e], where he shews, 1. in what Melchizedek prefigured Christ, viz. in name, person, and offering; and, 2. the preeminence of the Priesthood of Christ over the Priesthood of Aaron. He goes on to shew, how that sacrifice and intercession being the chief duties of this office, our Lord fulfilled both in His life[f]. As the Jewish hierarch annually entered the Holy of Holies, after slaying the victim, to offer the outpoured blood; so Christ, having immolated the sacrifice of His

[d] Psalm cx. 4. [e] Heb. v. et seq. [f] Heb. ix. 11.

life upon the Cross, entered into heaven to offer His own Blood poured out on the Cross.

II. As our Surety Christ took upon Him all our sins. This we gather from the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, where it is said, that He truly "bore our sorrows," and for this was wounded and afflicted. So St. Peter, "Who His own Self bare our sins upon the tree[g]; that we who were dead unto sin might live unto righteousness; by whose stripes we are healed." So St. Paul[h]; "He who knew no sin, for us was made sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him[i]." And, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; as it is written, Cursed is the man that hangeth on a tree."

III. That our Lord redeemed us by His Blood, is not less clear in the holy volume. We read, "Who gave Himself a redemption (query, the price of the redemption) for all[k]." "He gave Himself for us, to redeem us from all iniquity[l];" or, as St. Peter more clearly says[m], "Knowing that not with the corruptible price of silver and gold are we

[g] 1 Pet. ii. 24. [h] 2 Cor. v. 21. [i] Gal. iii. 13.
[k] 1 Tim. ii. 6. [l] 1 Tit. ii. 14. [m] 1 Pet. i. 18.

redeemed from the vain conversation given to you by your fathers, but with the precious Blood of Christ, as of a spotless Lamb;" implying, that just as gold and silver are given in price for any earthly thing, so the Blood of Christ has been given as the payment for our redemption.

IV. God was well pleased with Christ as our Mediator, and accepted His reconciliation of us. Being angry with us for our sins, and demanding their punishment, it became Him to be reconciled to us, when Christ, to expiate these, offered Himself to suffer in our place. Thus St. Paul, "When we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son[m]." And, "In Him it pleased the fulness of the Godhead to dwell, and by Him to reconcile all things in Him, making peace by the Blood of the Cross, of things, I say, in earth or in the heavens[n]."

Christ's suffering.

Our Lord is mentioned to have "suffered" for two reasons. *First*, to identify the suffering with the second Person of the adorable Trinity, in opposition to that phase of the Sabellian theory, which by maintaining the unity of person, had held that it was the Father who suffered, and was hence called Patripassianism.

[m] Rom. x. 10. [n] Col. i. 19.

These "dwelt with such exclusive zeal on the Unity of the Godhead, as to absorb, as it were, the whole Trinity into one undivided and undistinguished Being. The one supreme and impassible Father united to Himself the man Jesus Christ by so intimate a conjunction, that the Divine Unity was not destroyed;" a proposition, which though in one sense true, yet, as understood by them, laid them open to the blasphemous conclusion, that the Father must have suffered on the Cross. They thought that this specially belonged to the Father, since they believed that the οὐσία, or substance, was the property of the Father, and that the other two Persons were, as it were, ἐνεργείαι of Him.

Secondly, to controvert those heretics who maintained, that our Lord only suffered in semblance and not in in reality. Basilides and his followers held this; and that Simon the Cyrenian, who had been compelled to bear the cross, had been crucified in His stead[o].

It is necessary that we should express ourselves accurately on this point. "The divine Word endured all things in the flesh, His divine nature only remaining impassible. For in the one

[o] Irenæus, lib. i. adv. Hær. i. 23.

Christ, compounded of the Godhead and Manhood, existing in the Godhead and Manhood, and suffering, that which was born to suffer did suffer: but the impassible did not suffer. For the passible soul existing in the body suffers when it suffers, but the divinity being impassible cannot suffer with the body. Hence we may say, God suffered in the flesh, but we may not say that the Godhead suffered in the flesh, or that God suffered through the flesh[p]."

Christ's Burial.

Our Lord's "burial" is specially mentioned, first, to oppose the Docetæ, or Phantasiasts, and those who asserted our Lord was only in appearance dead. This error began in the time of the Apostles, and it is against these that St. John writes[q], "Many false prophets have gone out into the world," &c. Simon Magus held this doctrine.

2dly, To give new thoughts with regard to death, for the death and burial of Christ has stripped death of many of its terrors, and it was a sweet thought, but founded in truth, which termed the Christian's grave a resting-place, (cœmeterium,) and so St. Stephen fell on sleep: and the day on which blessed Mary was removed from this world is, in the Eastern Church,

[p] Dam. Orth. Fid. iii. 26. [q] 1 John iv. 3.

still called "The rest of the Virgin." S. Chrysostom says, "Before the coming of Christ, death was called death, and not only death, but hell; but when Christ came and died for the life of the world, death was no longer called death, but sleep and repose."

3dly and chiefly. The sepulture of Christ had its own direct work in our salvation, as every action of our Lord, being the action of God the Word, is of infinite value by reason of the greatness of the Agent. Each action of Christ has, as it were, a sacramental influence in man's salvation; wherefore in the Litany we invoke Him, "by the mystery of Thy holy incarnation, by Thy holy nativity and circumcision, by Thy Cross and Passion, by *Thy precious death and burial.*" Now the burial of our Lord has this virtue, that as the death of the old man in us, which is the inward work of the Spirit gradually destroying the remains of the fall in each one, emanates from the death of Christ, so the burial of the old man, which is effected in our baptism, is the fruit of His sepulture. S. Augustine[r] says, "Whatever was done on the Cross of Christ, at His burial, at His rising the third day, at His ascension into

[r] in Enchir. ad Laur.

heaven, and sitting at the right hand of God, were so done, that mystically, not in words only, but in actions, the Christian life here below might be depicted. For on account of His Cross it is written, "they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." Of His burial, "we are buried with Him by baptism unto death." Of His resurrection, that as "Christ rose from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we ought also to walk in newness of life." Of His ascension, and seat at the Father's right hand; "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God[s]."

4thly, The burial of our Lord helps much to systematize our thoughts with regard to His divine and human nature; for God the Word was hypostatically united both to body and soul, and therefore the body that was in the grave was as much the body of God as the soul that descended into hell; and yet we may not say that the divinity was crucified, or that the divinity was buried in the grave, which was an error of the Eutychians. "Although He died as a man, and His holy soul was separate from His pure body, the inseparable divinity

[s] See also Origen, lib. ii. adv. Cels.

remained with both body and soul. And even so the one Person was not divided into two Persons. For both body and soul, (κατὰ ταὐτὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς,) at once and together from the first, had their existence in the Person of the Word; and when these were separated in death, each of them remained, having the one Person of the Word. So that the one Person of the Word was the Person both of the Word, and of the soul, and of the body. For never had the soul or body a person of their own, but only that of the Word. Hence, though the soul was locally separated from the body, it was personally united to it by the Word[t]."

Vital union in Christ.

There are therefore in Christ two unions, the personal or hypostatic, and the vital union. The divine Person of the Word was personally united immediately to a soul, and also to a body, and that soul was united to that body by the vital union. Both these unions took place at the same moment, at the time of the Incarnation, when the blessed Virgin Mary said, "Be it unto me according to thy word." Both these unions lasted during the life of our Lord, but in His death, the vital union between

[t] Dam. Orth. Fid. lib. iii. 27.

His body and soul was dissolved, and the soul separated from the body, but the personal union was never severed; and therefore the divine Person of the Word remained united to the Body in the sepulchre, and also to the Soul, which descended into hell.

"And the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures." No confession of the Christian faith can be complete without an assertion of the Resurrection, for that was the one fact on which the early propagators of Christianity rested the truth of their mission. If they could convince their hearers, that a man, after undergoing a public execution, and lying in the grave for part of three days, had returned to life, and been "seen of many," and that before His death he had on many occasions announced that this should take place, they had gone far to shew that the person so spoken of was nothing short of Divine. And however unlike Deity the rest of the circumstances of his life were, that one fact truly believed was sufficient to remove the character and nature of the Subject out of the common laws of nature and reason, and to place It within the dominion of faith. Accordingly we find, in the Acts of the holy Apostles, that to preach "Jesus and the Resurrection,"

The Resurrection.

was the burden of their mission. e. g. "To whom also He shewed Himself alive after His Passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days[u]." "Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death[x]." "Unto you first, God having raised His Son Jesus, sent Him to bless you[y]." "And with great power gave the Apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus[z]." "Him God raised up the third day, and shewed Him openly[a]." "But God raised Him from the dead[b]." "Opening and alleging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead[c]." "Of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question this day[d]." "Of one Jesus, which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive[e]." "That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead[f]."

Now Christ rose again with His very body. It is true that that glorified Body exhibited properties, which our bodies possess not, which revealed to us in holy Scripture, prepare our

[u] Acts i. 3. [x] Acts ii. 24. and 31. [y] Acts iii. 26. also iv. 10. [z] Acts xviii. 33. [a] Acts x. 40. [b] Acts xiii. 30. [c] Acts xvii. 3. also 31 and 32. [d] Acts xxiii. 6. [e] Acts xxv. 19. [f] Acts xxvi. 23.

minds for the supralocal Presence of His Body in the Sacrament of the Altar. We find Him passing through closed doors, conveying Himself from place to place in an incredibly short time, not requiring the ordinary supplies of food, though eating to convince the disciples of His identity, but still with the Body in which He had lived He rose, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father. St. John Damascene says, "After His resurrection from the dead, He laid down all passions, that is to say, decay, hunger and thirst, sleep and toil, and such like; for although He tasted food after His resurrection, He did not do it by virtue of a law of nature, (for He did not hunger,) but by way of economy, to give faith in the truth of His resurrection, and to prove that it was the same flesh which suffered and rose again. He put off no part of His nature, either body or soul, but He possesses a body, and a rational and intellectual soul, that can will and act. And so He ascended into heaven, and so He sitteth at the right hand of God, willing, both as God and man, our salvation; as God, ordering the government, preservation, and providence of all things; as man, remembering

His conversation upon earth, seeing and knowing that He is adored by the whole reasoning creation. His holy soul knoweth this, because it is hypostatically joined to the Word of God, and so is worshipped as the soul of God, and not simply as soul. And the ascension into heaven, and again His return and coming again, are the actions of a circumscribed body. "For so He will come to us, as ye have seen Him go into heaven[g]."

Now the dead had returned to life before this; God's saints had ere this been endowed with power to recal the departed; our Lord had done so Himself; but all those who had come back from the unseen world, had come by another's power and at another's will. In the case of the Resurrection, our Lord did it by His own power. "Therefore doth my Father love Me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No man taketh it from Me, but I lay it down Myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again[h]." On which St. Cyril remarks, "He uses the word, I have power, to shew the consequences of His own nature, both that He had power over the very bonds of death itself,

[g] Fid. Orth. iv. 1. [h] John x. 17, 18.

and could easily change the nature of things, which is the property of Him Who is by nature God. And so He says, "Destroy this temple, and in three days *I will* raise it up[i]." And hence St. Paul adduces a proof of His divinity[k], "And declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead:" as much as to say, Had He not been consubstantial and of one kind with the Father, He could not have raised His flesh from the grave." Nor does this truth militate against those texts of Scripture, where it is said, that the Son was raised by the Father; for a holy Father[l] asks, "In what does the Father work? Surely in His own Power. And who is the Power of the Father? No one else but Christ, who is the Power of God and the Wisdom of God. Therefore the Saviour raised Himself, though it be said the Father raised Him." And another tells us[m], "If sometimes the Divinity of the Only-Begotten be said to have raised the Body, and sometimes the Father, there is no discrepancy, for Holy Scripture often ascribes to the Father what is done by the Son."

[i] John ii. 19. [k] Rom. i. 4. [l] Greg. Nyss. de Resur. Orat. 2. p. 402. t. iii. [m] Theodoret on 2 Cor. xiii. 4.

But in addition to the proof which the Resurrection has furnished of the truth of Christianity, it has itself a particular work in the salvation of man. It is closely connected with that part of man's redemption, which we term justification, our being made righteous. "Who was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification." "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins."

Justification.

Justification consists in the remission of sin and in the infusion of grace, and is thus both a forensic act, and a spiritual process within the soul. Yet these processes are not two but one, as the illumination of space and the dispersion of darkness is one and the same thing. When man by the sin of Adam lost his innocency, he became by nature the child of wrath, and so crippled in his powers, that neither Gentile by the law of nature, or Jew by the law of Moses, could do good. In this sad condition the Father of mercies and God of all comfort in the fulness of time sent His Son, whom He had promised, to redeem the Jews that were under the law, to lead the Gentiles which followed not after righteous-

ness, and to receive all into the adoption of sons. "Him God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His Blood, not only for our sins, but for the sins of the whole world." Yet though He died for all men, all shall not receive the benefit of His death, but they only to whom the merit of His Passion is communicated; for as actually men, unless they were born of the seed of Adam, would not be born unrighteous, seeing that they contract unrighteousness by that very birth; so, unless they are born again in Christ, they will never be made righteous, seeing that with that regeneration, by the merit of the Passion, that grace whereby they become righteous is given unto them. For this benefit the Apostle ever exhorts us to "give thanks unto the Father, Who hath given us to be partakers in the inheritance of the saints in light, and hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son; in whom we have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins." These words imply the justification of the sinner, inasmuch as therein is the translation from the state in which man is born as a child of Adam, into the state of grace and adoption by the second Adam, Jesus Christ our Saviour: which trans-

lation since the promulgation of the Gospel cannot take place but by the laver of regeneration, or by the desire of it at least; as it is written, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven." Justification in adults commences from the preventing grace of God by Christ, i. e. from His gracious call, whereby, from no merit of their own, they are called: so that they who by their sins were turned away from God, are by His grace moved to cooperate with that grace, so that God touching the heart of man by the illumination of the Holy Spirit, and man not resisting it, they come to justification. And this being so, aided by divine grace, and obtaining faith by hearing, they are freely influenced towards God, believing those things to be true which He has revealed, especially that justification is by Christ Jesus, and that therefore in spite of their sins they may yet hope in Him; and so commencing to love God and to hate sin, they propose to receive baptism, and to lead a new life. On this preparation justification follows, which is not only the remission of sin, but also sanctification and renovation of the inner man, by a voluntary reception of grace, and the gifts of the Spirit. By this he who was unrighteous becomes righteous, he who

was at enmity becomes the friend of God and an heir of everlasting life.

"We are justified by the Father, considered as the principal cause, by the Son as the meritorious purchaser, by the Spirit as the immediate efficient, by baptism as the ordinary instrument of conveyance, by faith as the instrument of reception, by faith and holiness as necessary qualifications and conditions for the receipt and preservation of it[n]." In other words, The final cause of justification is the glory of God, and eternal life. The efficient cause is the merciful God, who freely works and sanctifies. And the meritorious cause is His only-begotten Son Jesus Christ. The instrumental cause is the Sacrament of Baptism. The formal cause is the righteousness of God, not that whereby He is just, but that whereby He makes us just, in that, His Spirit dwelling in us, we are renewed in the spirit of our minds. Faith also is the beginning, foundation, and root of all our justification, and we are justified only for the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ, and not for our own works and deservings.

But when once justified, and made the friends and servants of God, we must go on from strength to strength, and be daily renewed in

[n] See Waterland, ix. p. 5.

our minds, by mortifying the flesh, and putting on the whole armour of righteousness. Then we shall be more and more justified, as it is written, "He that is righteous, let him be righteous still:" and it is this increase of justification that we seek, when we pray unto God to give us the increase of faith, hope, and charity.

Spiritual resurrection.

Besides this, our spiritual resurrection is closely connected with the resurrection of our Lord. In Baptism the catechumen descended into the water, and came up again out of it, to typify the death and resurrection of that Lord to whom he was now mystically united. This holy Sacrament 'represents unto us our profession, which is to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and to be made like unto Him, that as He died and rose again for us, so should we who are baptized die from sin, (typified by descent into the water,) and rise again unto righteousness,' which is signified by coming up out of the same. Thus the resurrection of the Lord is that which sanctifies the habitual state of grace, and the regenerate condition of the Christian. "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above . . . . for ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God[n]."

[n] Coloss. iii. 1, 3.

Lastly, the resurrection of Christ is a pledge of ours. He is the first-fruits of them that slept, and this very rising is an earnest that we shall rise also. "The Body shall follow the Head." St. Thomas° says, that the resurrection of Christ as the cause of our resurrection, working in the power of the Deity, extends itself to the resurrection both of soul and body. For it is of God that the soul lives by grace, and the body by the soul. Wherefore instrumentally the resurrection of Christ has an effective power as to the resurrection of man. By way of example, it effects the resurrection of souls, because our souls should be conformed to Christ risen from the dead; as the Apostle says, "That as Christ rose from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also ought to walk in newness of life." And as He rose from the dead, and dieth no more, so we also ought to esteem ourselves dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through the resurrection. And as to the resurrection of our bodies, the humanity of Christ being hypostatically joined to the divinity, has the quickening power, in the firm hope and expectation of which we calmly wait the end.

Pledge of our resurrection.

° 3a. 56. 1. 3.

XIV.

OF THE ASCENSION, ASSESSION, RETURN, AND REIGN OF OUR LORD.

AND ASCENDED INTO HEAVEN, AND SITTETH ON THE RIGHT HAND OF THE FATHER. AND HE SHALL COME AGAIN TO JUDGE BOTH THE QUICK AND THE DEAD, WHOSE KINGDOM SHALL HAVE NO END.

THE faith reveals to us, that forty days after His resurrection, our Lord ascended into heaven in sight of His disciples. Now though God is every where, yet heaven is ascribed to Him as His peculiar resting-place, as it is written, 'Heaven is my throne.' And yet we "are not to imagine any thing corporal about this inhabitation, for God being uncircumscribed filleth all places, but inasmuch as He rests in the holy spirits above, as in the saints, therefore we say, Heaven is His throne and dwelling-place[a]." As refers to the Deity then, we use the expression "place" metaphorically.

[a] Cyril. Alex. in Es. lxvi. 1. &c.

We talk about God being present or absent only in a secondary sense; but this is not so with regard to the Manhood of Christ. Of that we are to believe that it is still subject to certain of the laws of bodies; that while it is sacramentally on every altar in Christendom, it is locally and naturally in heaven, not every where, as the Lutherans falsely teach, but in that place of glory and majesty which is termed the right hand of the Father. St. Chrysostom (?) says, "If you hear that He ascended, do not think that there is a bodily change of place in God: for the Deity filleth all things, and is omnipresent; but He deigned to assume a body of the same kind with us: that was taken up on high[b]." "He ascended to heaven, not where God the Word was not before, for He was always in heaven, and abode in the Father; but where the Word made flesh had not sat before."

Nor are we to believe that the flesh sits in heaven senseless, like an empty scabbard with Christ removed from it, but the two natures are still undivided, and the Word still dwells in human flesh, and that rests on the throne of God.

[b] Hom. 161. Sav. t. v. and Ruff. in Symb. ap. Cypr.

Now the reasons for the ascension of Christ are manifold. It was not fitting that He should remain for ever on earth, and our condition required His ascension. Both our faith and our hope required that He should ascend, that we might be the more assured that the work of our redemption was finished, and that the kingdom of heaven was opened to all believers. "The ascension of Christ, says S. Leo, is our advancement, and whither the glory of the Head hath preceded, thither the hope of the body[c]." Christ was taken into heaven as the first-fruits of our nature. Christ has gone before, and we shall surely follow. "Whither the Forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an High Priest after the order of Melchisedec[d]." The ultimate destiny of the human race was revealed in our ascended Lord. The merciful intention of God in creation was fulfilled. The pattern Man did what was required of Him, and His end was that for which man was made. To be gathered unto God body and soul, and to become one with Him, to live in eternal bliss, such was the end of man, and such we see it exemplified in our Forerunner. What

[c] S. Leo, Serm. i. in Ascens. c. 4. [d] Heb. vi. 20.

encouragement here for the Christian, to be sure that there is a resting-place for the body and soul of man in the bosom of his Creator, and to know that as earnest of his final end, Human Nature is already there.

Christ our High Priest.

It is a consequence of the Ascension, that the Man Jesus Christ, the great High Priest of the new law, stands before the celestial altar, and ever exercises His sacerdotal office, in shewing forth to His Father His precious Passion, and in offering the prayers and supplications of the whole Church.

Now even heathenism was familiar with the sacerdotal character of the Deity. In the Hindoo system, the Deity is the Supreme Pontiff of the universe. He is law, He is intelligence, from whom all systems have been evolved. The Brahmin is an emanation from him, carrying to earth the attributes He possesses in heaven. The Arians, through the orientalism of Plato, adopted this sort of idea, for they held that Christ as the Word was an High Priest. The Church, on the contrary, held, that, according to the prophecy, "Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of

Melchizedech[e]," that He assumed this office at the moment of the Incarnation, not as God but as man. S. Cyril, writing on the text of St. Paul[f], 'consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession Christ Jesus, who was faithful to Him that appointed Him,' says, "St. Paul is not here declaring the nature, but the incarnation, of the Word. For when was He made the High Priest of our profession? when the Apostle? When was He faithful to Him that appointed Him? Was it not when for us men He was made man? As St. John writes, 'The Word was made flesh,' as man He was made faithful to His Maker, performing His work, as He Himself testifies. Then became He the Apostle, sent on our behalf and for us; then became He the High Priest of our confession, offering the acknowledgment of our faith to the Father, and His own Body as a pure offering to God, that He might cleanse us all by Himself[g]."

And His office is twofold. 1. That of intercession: as Augustine says[h]; "What doth the Priest for ever? What doth He? He

[e] Ps. cx. 4. [f] Heb. iii. 1. [g] S. Cyril, t. v. p. 213.
[h] In Ps. cix. (cx.) 4.

is at the right hand of the Father, and intercedeth for us, entering as a Priest the inner courts, and the holy of holies, and the secret places of heaven." 2. That of offering gifts and sacrifices for sin[i], even His own precious Body and sacred Blood. S. Epiphanius says[k], "And this, that He is made a Priest, means that in His Body He offered Himself to the Father for the human race. He the Priest, He the Victim, offered Himself, executing the High Priest's office for the whole creation; then spiritually and gloriously ascending into heaven, with the same Body He sat down at the Father's right hand, having become a High Priest for ever, and entered into the heavens." There also He offers the commemoration of the One Bloody sacrifice, in the unbloody sacrifice of the Eucharist, by the hands of His servants on earth.

The Eucharist.

"First, therefore, the shadow preceded, the image followed, the verity shall be. The shadow was in the Law, the image then in the Gospel, the truth in heavenly places. The shadow of the Gospel and of the Church was in the Law, the image of the future truth in the Gospel, the truth in the judgment of God.

[i] Heb. v. 1. [k] Hær. 69. c. 39.

Therefore of the things which are now celebrated in the Church, their shadow was in the words of the Prophets, in the flood, in the Red sea, when our fathers were baptized into the cloud and into the sea; in the rock, whence flowed water, and which followed the people. Was there not in the shadow the sacrament of this holy mystery: was there not in the shadow water from the rock, as if blood from Christ, which followed the people who fled from it, that they might drink, and not be thirsty; that they might be redeemed, and not perish. But now the shadow of the night of darkness of the Jews is past away, and the day of the Church is at hand. Now we see good things by an image, and we hold the good things of the image. We see the King of High Priests coming to us, we see and hear Him offering for us His own blood: we follow Him as we can, priests, that we may offer for the people sacrifice, feeble indeed in our deservings, yet honourable in our sacrifice, for though Christ is not beheld offering, He is offered on earth, when the Body of Christ is offered; indeed, He is manifested offering in us, Whose word sanctifies the sacrifice which is offered. And He indeed stands by the Father as our Advo-

cate: yet now we see Him not, but we shall see Him when the shadow has passed away, and the truth has come. Then we shall not see the things that are perfect through a glass, but face to face[1].

III. It was necessary also, that Christ as our King should enter into heaven. He had conquered death and hell, He had borne the burden of the heat of the day, and it was fit that, having suffered, He should enter into His glory, that He should triumph gloriously, coming from Edom with dyed garments from Bozrah, that He should reign and sit upon the throne of His Majesty. For Christ is not only King in His original nature, but He is King in His incarnate state. And as King He now sits upon the throne of grace, as He shall hereafter sit upon the throne of judgment. There is a throne of grace, and there shall be a throne of judgment; and they who come now in sincere faith to their King, will find acceptance and mercy, for now is the accepted time. Christ our King.

As Priest and King then, Christ sitteth at the right hand of the Father; as it is written, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right

[1] S. Ambros. in Ps. xxxviii. (xxxix.) §. 26. p. 852.

hand;" and that right hand means the highest honour; as a Greek Father[m] says, "When you hear of the right hand of God, do not describe to yourself places and scenes of glory. For right and left concern those things which can be circumscribed, but God is uncreate and undefined, formless and uncircumscribed. Therefore understand by right hand, His glory and honour." And S. Augustine explains the right hand of the height of felicity, and pleasures evermore. It is, in short, beatitude, the final consummation of bliss. And S. Jerome adds to this idea, the thought of power; wherefore the Creed continues, "Whose kingdom shall have no end." Indeed some of the Fathers gathered an argument for the equality of the Father and the Son from this. Theophylact says, "He sitteth at the right hand of the Majesty on high, not because God is included in place, but to shew that He is of equal honour with the Father. For He has reached His Father's throne, and as the Father is in heaven, so is He."

The Judgment.

"And He shall come again to judge the quick and the dead." The Constantinopolitan Fathers added, "with glory," to describe the

[m] Q. 45. de Parabol. Evang. ap. S. Athan. t. ii. p. 318.

chief circumstance of that awful event. Now a real belief in the Last Judgment is a great grace from God. Many who have a vague idea of a future retribution, (for a belief in that is deeply written in the nature of man,) cannot bring home to themselves the awful strictness of its particulars. They imagine, that at the end there will be a sort of balance struck, that the bad will no doubt be punished and the good rewarded, but this does not go much into their practice. It goes so far as to make them afraid when they have committed a great crime, or it gives them a general uneasy sensation when they take a general review of their lives; but it does not influence their actions, above all it does not instigate them to holy action. Conscience being mainly prohibitory requires the addition of faith to stimulate it to righteous exertion. Now if there be one point strongly pressed, it is the strictness of that inquisition which will take place in the Judgment; as it is written, "For every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give an account." "And I saw all the dead, small and great, stand before God: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works."

Now having established the subject-matter of the Judgment, that there is to be such an awful day, the Creed has attached the office of Judgment to the Son of God. In one sense God absolutely is the Judge, and the last day is called "that great day of God Almighty[n]," but we are also told that He hath given all judgment to the Son, because He is the Son of man. "Behold, He cometh in the clouds, and every eye shall see Him, and they also that pierced Him." It was fitting that He who is the Mediator of the New Testament, the Priest, the Lord, the Intercessor, the Brother, the Spouse, the Head, should also be the Judge; that He through Whom all grace has been given, should be the rewarder of cooperation with it, the punisher of its despite; that the Lord of Life should be its apportioner; that the Maker of man should award his final destiny. "He shall come as Judge, who once stood before the judge; He shall come in that form in which He was judged, that they may see who pierced Him, and that they who received Him not may know Him[o]."

And who are the objects of the Judgment? "The quick and the dead." Though some have interpreted these terms of the souls and bodies,

[n] Rev. xvi. 14. [o] S. Aug.

others of the good and bad, yet it seems more probable that the more literal meaning is the true one, viz. those who are alive at the moment of the Judgment, and the great mass of the departed. Next to the strictness of the great day, its suddenness and unexpectedness are what are most frequently insisted on in Holy Scripture. The Son of Man shall come as a thief in the night. The similes of the antediluvian world, and the destruction of Sodom, all imply that the world shall be going on just as it is now, when the Judgment comes, and therefore the world shall be peopled, and those alive shall be caught up quick to judgment.

Lastly, the ends of the Judgment are, 1. The conclusion of that great scheme of probation, whereby each child of Adam goes through his trial, and as he fulfils his mission or fails in it, shall be rewarded or punished accordingly. It is the end of all those providences which are connected with the free will of man. Each man's life is a course of trial, and the end alone shews the result. Now though as a matter of fact, a particular judgment must needs be passed on each one at the hour of death, to determine his position in the intermediate state, yet it needs the solemnity of the final day to declare it.

2. And next, it is the great means by which the justice of God is made manifest. Here we only see the end of the golden chain that hangs between heaven and earth, and there are many providences which we cannot fathom. We see virtue crushed to the earth, and vice triumphing. We see the most total disproportion of the lots of men. Why should the lord have more than the beggar? We see one man carried to the grave after a life of uninterrupted success, another the victim of the frowns of fortune. Why is this? Though God occasionally gives us hints of His justice, and shews us just enough to convince us that it is well with the righteous and ill with the wicked even here; yet to mark the Christian dispensation, (unlike the earlier times,) he has referred the ultimate retribution both of good and bad to the future state. And accordingly, when the great day comes, much that is inscrutable to us now will be cleared up.

3. God has revealed to us the Judgment, that by the thought of it we should be urged both to piety and patience[p]. "Blessed is that soul, which day and night hath no other care than how, in the great day, when every creature shall stand around the Judge to give an account of their

[p] S. Bas. p. 1050. Ep. 283. hod. 174.

works, she shall be able to relate her life. For whosoever continually places that day and that hour before his eyes, and ever thinks of his defence at that most just tribunal, is likely to commit no sin, or at least very few." Hence also S. Chrys. says[q], "Let us ever be saying to ourselves and to others, there is a resurrection, and a terrible judgment awaiting us."

"Whose kingdom shall have no end." There are two kingdoms of Christ which shall have an end, bright and glorious though they be. The kingdom of His power, which at this moment extends to the utmost system, and embraces all things, shall cease to be when God is all in all. The kingdom of His grace, holy, pure, and blessed though it be, shall cease when faith is merged in sight, and hope in fruition, but the kingdom of His glory shall have no end. It shall last for ever.

The reason why this Article of the Creed was declared was, that Origen believed that the kingdom of Christ after many ages should end. Marcellus of Ancyra thought that the office of King was committed to Him temporarily, and that He Himself, abandoned by the Word, which was only transiently inhabiting Him,

[q] Hom. xlv. in Joh. Sav. t. ii. p. 742.

would be reduced to nothing. The Church, on the other hand, held, that Christ as man should reign for ever. Hence this dogma implies also the eternity of the Incarnation. "Wonder," says S. Chrysostom, "at the awfulness and ineffable nature of this mystery. He shall for ever inhabit this tabernacle. He has put on our flesh, not as if to lay it aside again, but to have it ever with Himself. For otherwise, He would not have deemed it worthy of the Royal Throne, nor would He have been adored, wearing it, by all the heavenly host of Angels, Archangels, Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, and Powers[r]."

[r] In Joan. Hom. xi. ver. fin.

XV.

OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

AND IN THE HOLY GHOST, THE LORD, THE LIFE GIVER, WHO PROCEEDETH FROM THE FATHER (AND THE SON), WHO WITH THE FATHER AND THE SON IS WORSHIPPED AND GLORIFIED, WHO SPAKE BY THE PROPHETS.

THE very structure of the Creed here is supposed to imply a confession of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, as reckoning Him with the Father and the Son. "If the Spirit be a creature, how can we believe in Him, or how are we perfected in Him. It is not the same to believe a thing and to believe in it. The one appertains to the Deity, the other to any thing[a]." Epiphanius points this out to us, and says, that it means more than the mere assertion of His existence, implying also His consubstantial unity with the Father and the Son.

[a] Greg. Naz. Orat. 37. hod. 31. §. 6.

Divinity of the Holy Ghost.

What then does the Faith reveal to us concerning this Person in the adorable Trinity. "The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with Them, very and eternal God. He is the Comforter, the gift of God, and the eternal subsisting love of the Father and the Son."

He is proved to be God, 1. because every creature serves God, and the Spirit does not serve Him, therefore the Spirit is not a creature. 2. Every creature has a determinate nature, but the Spirit is omnipresent. "Whither shall I go then from Thy Spirit? The Spirit of the Lord hath filled the earth." 3. The Spirit is not found to be created neither in the first creation, or in the recreation in Christ, or in the final creation, which is the resurrection of the dead, but in each of these He cooperates. 4. If we are the temples of the Holy Spirit. Temples only belong to God. 5. And lastly, the form of Baptism[b] is held to give proof of the divinity of the Spirit, inasmuch as He is mentioned similarly with the Father and the Son. So also in the Apostolic Benediction. "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you."

[b] See S. Basil, Ep. 141. hod. 8. §. 11.

Moreover, He must be truly and properly God, to whom the name of God, the divine properties and operations, divine worship, honour, and dignity, and, lastly, divine origin and procession, are attributed.

And first, as to the name of God, St. Peter accusing Ananias says, "Why hath Satan tempted thine heart to lie unto the Holy Ghost? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God[c]."

Then as to properties; we have Omniscience attributed to Him in the verse, "The Spirit searcheth all things, even the hidden things of God[d]." "When the Spirit is come, He will lead you into all truth[e]." Omnipotence: "The same Spirit which raised our Lord from the dead, shall quicken your mortal bodies[f]." Omnipresence, "The Spirit of the Lord hath filled the earth[g]." Inspiration: "Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Creation: "Thou sendest forth Thy Spirit, they are created[h]." The working of miracles: "If I by the finger of God cast out devils . . . in the Spirit of God[i]." Operation of grace[j]. Gifts of Teaching and Ministry[k]. Remission of sins, and regene-

[c] Acts v. 3. [d] 1 Cor. ii. 10. [e] John xvi. 13.
[f] Rom. viii. 11. [g] Wisd. i. 7. [h] Ps. civ. 30.
[i] Matt. xii. 28. [j] Luke i. 38. [k] Is. lxi.

ration[l]. The good of the Church[m]. Granting of gifts[n]. Sanctification[o]. Resurrection[p].

But some have objected, that the Holy Spirit is not a Person in the Godhead, but a certain power or influence of God metaphorically impersonated, just as death, sin, the law, and sacred Scripture, are sometimes in Scripture invested with personal qualities[q].

To this we may answer, that the texts we have adduced above prove not only the divinity but the personal and hypostatical existence of the Holy Ghost. For He is described as living and working equally with the Father and the Son. Moreover He is described as being sent, as also the Son is sent. He is declared to be "another" in comparison with the Father and the Son: if then the Father and the Son be two hypostases or subsistent persons, it follows that the Holy Ghost is so also.

And as to the figures of speech, it must be said, that in all these cases quoted it is quite clear that the Apostle is speaking metaphorically; and to push the argument to its legitimate consequence,

[l] 1 Cor. vi. 11. [m] Acts xiii. 2. [n] 1 Cor. xii. 4. [o] 2 Thess. ii. 12. and 1 Pet. i. 2. Rom. v. 5. [p] Rom. viii. 11. [q] Rom. v. 2. James i. 15. Rom. vi 12. Rom. vii. 23. Gal. iii. 24. Gal. iii. 8.

it would turn every Scriptural personage into allegory.

And He is described as being,

I. Holy[r]. St. Cyril[s] says, "He is called holy, and God is holy. Thus the celestial powers celebrate Him, not as having an imparted holiness; . . . He is holy by nature, as being from and in the naturally holy God." S. Athanasius[t] says, "That which is not sanctified by another, nor partaketh of holiness, but is Itself that partaker of, and by which all creatures are sanctified; how can He be one of these, or apart of the nature of these things that receive of Him." "The whole Trinity is one Spirit, one love. But when the word holy is added, when we speak of the love of the Father and of the Son, then we speak of the Holy Ghost only. For the Father is a Spirit, and the Father is holy, but He is not the Holy Spirit[u]."

II. The Lord, or "the Lordly." "He the same is Lord, who is the Spirit of the Lord, that is, He has called the Spirit of God Lord; as where the Apostle says, "The Lord is that Spirit: and where is the Spirit of the Lord, there

[r] See S. Chrys. P Hom. 72. t. 6.
[s] De Sp. t. v. p. 665.
[t] Ad Serap. §. 23. t. i. p. 671.
[u] Rich. c. S. Vict. p. 424. Sum. Sent. Tract. i. c. x.

is liberty[x]. Wherefore you have the Holy Spirit called Lord, for the Son and the Holy Spirit are not one Person, but one thing[y]."

III. He is termed "Life-giving," as in the Romans[z] He is termed the "Spirit of Life." "By the Holy Spirit is given the restoration of Paradise, the return into the kingdom of heaven, the restoration of the adoption of sons, the confidence of calling God our Father, the communion of the grace of Christ, the appellation of sons of light, the participation of eternal glory: in a word, the plenitude of benediction, both in the present time, and in the future of good things prepared for us[a]." "The world had not eternal life, because it had not received the Spirit; for where is the Spirit, there is eternal life: for the Spirit is He who worketh eternal life[b]."

Procession of the Holy Spirit.

IV. He is described in the original form of the Creed as "proceeding from the Father." Pope Sergius III. is supposed to have added, "and the Son," in order to express the whole truth on the subject. Baronius attributes this to Pope Nicholas; Binius to Benedict VII.[c] The

[x] 2 Cor. iii. 17. [y] S. Ambrose De Sp. S. ii. 1. p. 637. [z] Rom. viii. 2. [a] S. Bas. de Spir. S. c. 15. [b] S. Ambrose De Sp. S. p. 639. [c] Vide not. B. n. ap. Labbe t. ii. p. 1156.

Holy Ghost is of the Father and the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding; while Christians must rejoice in every full declaration of the faith of God, yet it is sad to think that this is one of the subjects which have rent the Christian world. The Greek Church still maintains the incomplete faith upon this subject. She asserts in the very words of the Creed, that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father.

At what time this error sprung up in the Church is doubtful. It is probable that it arose at the time of the Macedonian and Arian controversies. Theodoret first attacked S. Cyril, because that in the eleventh Anathematism against the Nestorians, he termed the Holy Spirit, Spiritum Christi Proprium, the peculiar Spirit of Christ. Also the Monothelites reproached S. Martin I. for asserting the double procession in his Synodical Letter[d].

As we said, it is also doubtful at what time the Filioque was inserted in the Creed. It is agreed on all hands, that the Creed begun to be sung with the addition in Spain, when the Arian Goths were converted, A.D. 589. Through Gaul and Germany this usage penetrated to

[d] S. Maximi, Epist. ad Marin. Cyp. Mansi, t. x. p. 696.

Italy. Leo III. allowed it, but hung up the Creed on tablets without the addition. Benedict VIII. allowed the Constantinopolitan Creed to be sung at the Mysteries, and then with the addition.

Now we believe that the Holy Spirit eternally proceedeth from the Father and the Son, as from one principle and by one spiration. This may be proved from the holy Scriptures, "He shall glorify Me: for He shall receive of mine: therefore said I, that He shall take of mine, and shew it unto you[e]." Here the Holy Spirit receiveth of the Son, because what the Son hath He hath from the Father, and of this is Substance by generation; and this Substance which is one with the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit receiveth.

As the Son has all things in common with the Father, and the Spirit receives of the Son, therefore the Spirit receives of the Father and the Son, as from one principle.

Again, in the same chapter[f], our Lord promises to send the Spirit, and He is elsewhere called the Spirit of Truth, which is the Word[g], the Spirit of Christ[h], and the Spirit

[e] John xvi. 13. [f] ver. 7. [g] ver. 13. [h] Rom. viii. 9.

of the Son[i]. "The Spirit is not foreign (alienus) to the Son, for He is called the Spirit of Truth, and Christ is the Truth; and He proceeds from Him as from God the Father[k]."

It is not necessary[l] that one should speak of Him, for He must be confessed as having origin from the Father and the Son, (quia de Patre et Filio auctoribus confitendus est.)

"Seeing that the Holy Spirit[m] proceedeth from the Father and the Son, He is not separated from the Father or the Son." And[n], "As the Son is begotten of the Father, and the Spirit proceedeth from the Father and the Son, so the will is generated by the understanding, and from both of these the memory proceeds."

S. Augustine, in stating[o] that the Spirit proceeds from the Father *principaliter*, says, "And therefore I have added *principaliter*, because the Spirit is found to proceed from the Son also. But this too His Father gave Him, not as to one before in being, if not yet having. But whatsoever He gave to the only-begotten

[i] Gal. iv. 6. [k] S. Cyril. Ep. ad Nest. De Exc. §. 10. Con. Eph. i. 26. [l] See S. Hilary De Trinitate, lib. ii. 29. [m] S. Ambros. de Spir. Sanct. c. i. 10. [n] In the book De Dignitate Hum. Cond. c. xi. [o] S. Aug. de Trin. b. xv. c. 17.

Word He gave in begetting. So He begat Him, that from Him also the common gift should proceed, and that the Holy Spirit should be the Spirit of Both."

"There is One who begat, Another who was begotten, and Another who proceedeth from both[p]."

Among the Greeks, S. Athanasius says[q], "The Son is the Fountain of the Holy Spirit," and[r], "He giveth to the Spirit, and whatever the Spirit hath He hath from the Son." S. Basil says[s], "Because He is called the Spirit of Christ. As the Comforter He expresses in Himself the goodness of the (other) Comforter by Whom He is sent, and exhibits in His own dignity the glory of Him from Whom He proceeds[t]."

SS. Epiphanius, Didymus, Cyril of Alexandria, and Greg. Nyssen, while they do not use the complete formula, evidently teach the full doctrine on the subject. The first says, "The Holy Spirit only is termed from the Father and the Son, the Spirit of Truth, the Spirit of God, and the Spirit of Christ[u];" "a third light

[p] S. Leo Mag. Ep. xciii. [q] De Trin. xix. [r] Orat. 3. cont. Arian. [s] lib. de Sp. S. c. 18. [t] See Petavius de Trinitate 60. vii. 3 et 4. [u] Hær. lxxiv. n. 9.

from the Father and the Son[x]." Greg. Nyssen[y], "The same thing must be said concerning the Holy Spirit: the order only is different. For as the Son is united to the Father, and having being from Him, yet exists not after Him in the order of time; so again, the Holy Ghost receives of the Only-Begotten, who is only in thought, after the manner of a principle, contemplated before the existence of the Spirit. For intervals of time have no place in that life which is before all worlds, so that putting aside the thought of origination (*αἰτία*), the Trinity in nothing differs from itself." S. Cyril of Alexandria, proving to Palladius that the soul of man is not the Spirit of God, because it is subject to change, says, "In no way is the Spirit of God mutable: for if it hath the infinity of change, this taint would be referred to the Divine Nature, *εἴπερ ἐστὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ Πατρὸς, καὶ μὴν καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ οὐσιωδῶς ἐξ ἀμφοῖν εἴτουν ἐκ Πατρὸς δ' Υἱοῦ προχεόμενον Πνεῦμα.* There are many other passages in S. Cyril to the same effect[z].

It is true also that some Eastern divines hold the true doctrine, but object to the interpo-

[x] Hær. lxxiv. 8. [y] Adv. Eunom. lib. ad fin. [z] Petav. Trin. lvii. c. 3.

lation of the Creed, thus transferring the question from being a matter of faith to being a matter of authority. Others connect the procession, not with the eternal existence of the Holy Spirit, but with the economy of man's redemption; but it is to be feared, that the retention of the incomplete formula has had its effect, and that very many of the orthodox Easterns do hold the single procession. "We assert that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and is the Spirit of the Father; we do not assert that the Spirit proceeds from the Son, but we term Him the Spirit of the Son[a]." It is true that very many of the Fathers do speak in language, which at first sight justifies them. Thus S. Gregory Nazianzen says[b], "The Spirit is truly the Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Father, not like a Son, nor by way of generation, but by way of procession." But elsewhere he says[c]; "We must believe in one God the Father, without beginning and unbegotten; and one Son, begotten of the Father; and one Holy Spirit, having His substance *from God*, yielding to the Father only in not being unbegotten,

[a] Dam. Orth. Fid. i. 9. [b] Orat. 39. §. 12. p. 630.
[c] Orat. 26. Hir. 32. §. 5. p. 445.

and to the Son in not being begotten, but in all things else of one nature, dignity, glory, and honour." St. Epiphanius says, "Always[d] has the Spirit proceeded from the Father and received of the Son: for He is not different from the Father and the Son, but is from the same Essence, from the same Deity, from the Father and the Son, with the Father and Son."

Yet, after all, we may humbly hope, that the discrepancy is one of words, for the Greeks confess that the Spirit is not only the Spirit of the Father, but of the Son; that He has the same substance, divinity, and majesty as the Father and the Son; that He receives of the Son, and so cannot speak of Himself; that He is manifested and given to us by the Son; and therefore we may charitably conclude, that while from a veneration for the Councils of Nicæa and Constantinople, they wish to keep the Creed untouched, they do in fact maintain that truth so necessary to salvation.

Besides these descriptions of the Spirit, we learn that most mysteriously He is the eternal Love of the Father and the Son, the bond of union in the Adorable Trinity; whence He is

[d] Epiph. Hær. 62. c. 4.

What inconsistent language for an orthodox Christian!

termed, Osculum Patris et Filii, and the sweet Savour, the Breath of the Nostrils, the Unguent, and the Seal. He is also called by excellence, the Gift, the Finger of God, the Ambassador, and the Director, alluding to the Constantinopolitan expression, "the Lord." As the Son is the manifestation of the Intellect of the Deity, so the Spirit is that of His Will. Hence His office in the work of the Incarnation in which "God commended His love" to us. As God is the first cause and origin of all good, the fountain and principle of it, He is the Summum Bonum: and therefore blessedness can rest no where else but in It. God then alone is properly and principally blessed. But how can He be blessed, whom the self-same thing that He is pleaseth not, (cui idipsum non placet quod est)? Whosoever is blessed, both loveth Himself, and loveth that which He is. If, therefore, the Father and the Son, and the Love of the Father and of the Son, are one thing, and are one God, since in Him alone is perfect blessedness, each must love Himself, and also each other. And as by nature the Father and the Son, and the Love of the Father and the Son, are one, so also they cannot be not one in love and will also.

They love one another with one love, because they are one: nor does the one love aught else in the other than He loves in Himself; that which Each is, is not from another source than that which the Other is. What the Father loves in the Son, the Son loves in Himself. And what the Love of the Father and the Son, loves in the Son, the Son loves in Himself. What the Son loves in the Father, the Father loves in Himself, and what the Love of the Father and of the Son loves in the Father, the Father loves in Himself. What the Father and the Son love in their own love by the Spirit, that the Love of the Father and the Son loves in Himself. What the Father loves in Himself, He loves in the Son and in His Love. And what the Son loves in the Father and in His Love, He loves in Himself, and what the Love of the Father and Son loves in Himself, He loves in the Father and the Son; Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified[f].

They who denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit were,

I. The followers of Simon Magus, who maintained that He was only an energy, not a

[f] Rich. S. Victor. vii. 23. p. 52.

person in the Deity. This is plainly refuted by 1 Cor. xii.

II. Those who made the Holy Spirit the servant and minister of God, as the Macedonians. Connected with which were those,

III. Who maintained that He was a creature. This was the belief of the Arians, and in fact of the Macedonians also. Eunomius maintained that the Spirit was not personal, but the creation of the Son.

The equality of the Spirit with the Father and the Son is proved by these things, which being the attributes of God, are in Holy Scripture applied to It. As the fact that the Son "came forth" from the Father is proof of His consubstantiality, so that the Spirit proceedeth from Him proves the same. "If the wisdom which proceedeth from the mouth of God cannot be called created; nor the Word that is declared from His Heart, nor the Power in which is the fulness of the Eternal Majesty; so neither can the Spirit which is breathed from the mouth of God, seeing that God so declares His unity, as to say, that He poureth forth of His own Spirit[z]."

[z] Ambros. 1 Sp. S. c. 8.

The form of Baptism further shews this; "for what community can exist between the Creator and the creature? how shall that which is made be numbered along with the Maker, for the perfect initiation of all[h]?" "God is one, for we are not baptized unto the *names* of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, but into the *name*. When you hear one name, there is one God[i]."

Inspiration of the Prophets.

"Who spake by the Prophets." Although this expression clearly announces both the fact, that God by His Spirit has been pleased to vouchsafe some revelation of his will to the creatures of His Hand; and also, that that revelation has in deed been conveyed by means of certain persons called the Prophets, whose existence and writings were recognised facts at the time of the Council of Constantinople; yet neither of these assertions are what the Fathers there assembled intended to impose upon the Church by this term. On the contrary, it seems clear that the expression is used as a corroborative proof of the divinity of the Holy Ghost; as much as to say, since He who is worshipped and glorified, together with the Father and the Son,

[h] Athan. Orat. ii. 41. cont. Arian. [i] S. Aug. Tract. vi. 9. Joan.

has also spoken by the Prophets, He is and must be God. No one then doubted that God had spoken by the Prophets, that is, by men sent by Him; although the Marcionites, and some sects of the Manichees, held the Old Testament to be the work of an inferior and malignant power. There was a general belief among the faithful in the inspiration of the Prophets; there was therefore no need of asserting this. And so, the general inspiration of the prophetic works was allowed by all sects; and in fact nothing was said in the Council either about the canonicity or inspiration of the sacred records. But it was highly proper, that in supplying the faithful with a form of truth concerning the third Person of the Adorable Trinity, that this peculiar energy of His should be dwelt on, both as affording strong evidence of His divine nature, and as inculcating the belief in one great sphere of His operation, connected especially with the next Article in the Creed, "I believe One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church."

It is difficult to trace the immediate motive of this addition, either in the Acts of the Council, or in the works of S. Gregory Nazianzen, to whom this is attributed; but it would seem, that it was the natural embodiment of the tradition of the

Church on the subject of the Holy Spirit, which in an earlier time, rendered necessary by the Marcionite heresy, had come to be intimately connected with the Church's thought concerning It, even when the immediate danger had passed away. In earlier times, as in S. Justin[k] and S. Clement[l], we see that this was one of the natural ideas connected with the Holy Spirit; and we find it is embodied in one of the earlier Creeds, the Creed used in the Church of Jerusalem.

And here one cannot fail remarking, how that Holy Spirit, in putting into the minds of the Fathers of Constantinople to assert this His mighty operation, provided for the refutation of heresies not then developed. It is fitting that we should believe, that the authoritative words of an Œcumenical Council, being guided by God, should possess that same power which the written word of God possesses, of having a meaning and significance far beyond the mind of those who uttered it; and therefore, though the Constantinopolitan Fathers did not at the time think that they were providing against a future evil, they were in truth supplying the Church with a weapon to be used in these last

[k] Apol. i. 6. 13. 31. 32. 33. [l] Pæd. i. 5.

days, when the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures is being so ruthlessly attacked. This is not the place to enter upon this question; but it comforts the mind to dwell upon the verity, that the Church has in all ages been deeply convinced of the truth, that the Holy Spirit has indeed inspired the writers of the Sacred Volume, and that to whatever degree He influenced them, how far soever He may have employed their peculiarities of nature, or overruled their identities, what they have transmitted to us is the undoubted word of God.

XVI.

OF THE CHURCH.

AND I BELIEVE ONE HOLY CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

THE word Church is derived from the Greek word κυριακὴ, and teaches us thereby that it belongs to the Lord God. It is His House, His Servant, His chaste Spouse; His own, by purchase at the price of His own Blood. It is expressed in Greek and Latin by the word ἐκκλησία, from the word ἐκκαλέω, teaching us that it implies a selection, and means the congregation of the elect, "the assembly of the saints, welded together (συγκεκροτημένον), out of a true faith and a good government[a]."

Of the Church of God there be two parts, one triumphant and one militant, one invisible and the other visible. In the invisible Church are all they who having finished their course in faith, do now rest from their labours. In what- The invisible Church.

[a] Isid. Pels. Ep. lib. ii. 246.

ever state or condition they may be, all are members of the Catholic Church. Yet all are not in the same state; for our Lord says, "In My Father's house are many mansions." It is not for us to rend the veil which the Providence of God has hung before the portal of the place of departed spirits; but this we know, that "blessed are the dead that die in the Lord, for they rest from their labours;" and to such to be "absent from the body," is to be "present with the Lord;" and some are waiting till their change come[b]. But in whatever state they are, each one has his place assigned to him, according as he has cooperated with the grace given unto him. "Their works do follow them." All are saved, all united to Christ, all one with Him, yet "one star differeth from another star in glory." They "who have not defiled themselves," have a song which none but they can sing, and they who have shed their blood for Christ, are near Him "under the altar;" and the Apostles sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, and she from whom He received His human body, and who was more blessed in that she heard the word and kept it, than

[b] Job xiv. 14.

that hers was the womb that bare Him, is there, in the glory given to her as the Mother of Him Who is God. For as His Manhood is not lost in His Godhead, but is deified; and His Godhead and Manhood, joined together in One Person, are never to be divided, so does she remain for ever the Mother of Him, Who, being before the worlds born of The Father, God the Word, was in the last days incarnate and born, as Man, of her. Nor are the holy angels, with their nine wondrous orders, excluded from the Church's pale. Though not the subjects of redemption, yet are they in the Church of God[c]. But high above all in this mighty republic, sits enthroned amid ten thousand seraphs, Jesus the Son of Mary, the King of saints, and the Head of the holy Church. He it is Who is the Joy and Bread of angels. He it is Who communicates, as from a source, life and vigour, by His Spirit through all His members. He it is who is "set in the heavenly places far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but in that which is to come;" under whose feet "all things are put, and Who is head over all things to the Church[d]."

[c] S. Nicet. Exp. Symb. Ang. Mai. vii. 336. [d] Eph. i. 20.

He it is Who is "the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, called of God, an High Priest after the order of Melchizedech[e]."

The visible Church.

And by the communion of saints all this extends to earth; to us poor miserable creatures, if so be that we are His. For by the visible Church, we understand that Society, founded by Him, in which, by means of an enduring Apostolate, the deeds wrought by Him in His mortal life, for the redemption and sanctification of mankind, are, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, continued to the end of the world. In other words, the Catholic Church is the Body of Christ, "assumed[f] by the Word made Flesh," "is [g]joined to the Flesh of Christ," His[h] body, His temple, His house, His city, whereof Christ is the Head and Indweller, and Sanctifier, and King, and wherein He to the end manifests Himself, so that 'the Head and Body are whole Christ.'"

As Christ its Head is God and Man, so His Body, the Church, has a visible human being and an inward invisible Divine life, whereof the Divine element, so to speak, pervades and penetrates, rules and directs, nourishes and

[e] Heb. iii. 1. v. 10.
[f] S. Aug. in Ps. iii. §. 9.
[g] Id. in 1 John i. §. 3.
[h] Id. in Ps. cxxxi. §. 3.

animates, the human, and, of both, makes one body of Christ. The human part is only the organ of the Divine. This oneness between Christ and His Church is clearly shewn in the Gospels and Epistles. "Inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me[i]." "For we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones[k]." "I in them, and Thou in Me[l]."

Thus the Church is the living Body of Christ, manifesting Himself, and working through all ages. The Redeemer did not merely live eighteen hundred years ago, so as since to have disappeared and to exist only in history; He is, on the contrary, eternally living in the Church. He is the abiding and the only teacher. His are all the baptisms, absolutions, confirmations, ordinations. The Church is not a lifeless corpse, but His living body, instinct with, penetrated, quickened, hallowed by His life. She renews in image, and applies His redeeming acts, when offering the sacrifice of His Body. In fact, He is one person with His Church, as S. Augustine says; "Christ and the Church are both one person, (*unus*,) but the Word and the flesh are not both one in substance, (*unum*.)

[i] Matt. xxv. 40. [k] Eph. v. 30. [l] John xvii. 22.

The Father and the Word are both one substance, (*unum*,) Christ and the Church are both one person, (*unus*)[m]." "Whole Christ consisteth of Head and Body[n]." The Head is the only-begotten Son of God; the Body is the Church; the Bridegroom and the Bride, two in one flesh.

The visible Church then is "the fulness," the complement[o], of Him that filleth all in all. In it heaven and earth are blended together; an immediate vital communication of man with the Divine and the Eternal is vouchsafed here on earth and now. The presence of God through it makes itself felt, "for the kingdom of God is within you." It is the outward visible sign or Sacrament of the unseen realities of the next world. Eternity crushes in upon time: the divine takes into itself what is human, heaven blends with earth, God's kingdom, legislative, disciplinary, is set up among us.

Hence the importance of questions which some Christians have despised as belonging to the externals of religion, e. g. the Apostolic succession. It is not a mere question what is to be the constitution of the Church, as a

[m] S. Aug. in Ps. ci. Serm. i. § 2. [n] In Ps. cxxxviii. §. 2. [o] S. Chrys. ad Eph. i. 24.

convenience or edification, but the question is, where do the promises of Christ rest, what is the vehicle of His Presence, through what earthly channel does He reign?

The first attribute of the Church which the Creed declares is, that it is one. As Christ is one, and as His work is one, so there is one truth, for He is the incarnate Truth. And if there be one truth, there must needs be one vehicle of it. That unity is the object and the result of the Saviour's Prayer, and it finds its model in the mysterious relation which exists between the Father and the Son. It is of so high and exalted a nature, that it is only by the communication of a higher life that it can exist. And as it is divine in its source, so is it divine in its effect; for by this unity men the more believe the mission of Christ; "that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." Unity.

Of unity S. Cyprian thus writes; "We read of our blessed Lord saying to Peter, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in

heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.' And again, after His resurrection, our Lord saith unto the same Peter, 'Feed my sheep.' And though we may observe Him giving the same power to all His Apostles, when He saith, 'As my Father sent me, so send I you,' yet to manifest His regard for unity, He took His rise from one, and settled the whole upon that foundation. The other Apostles were in truth what Peter was, entitled to an equal share with them of dignity and power; but I say the process began in one, that the Church might be considered as one; which one Church, the Holy Ghost personating Christ, hath described to us in Solomon's Song, saying, "My dove, my undefiled is but one, she is the only one of her mother. She is the choice one of her that bare her[p]." Again, "Thus the Church of Christ, which is overspread with light from heaven, diffuses its rays over the face of the whole earth, and yet its light is one and single which is thus diffused, nor is the unity of its body in any way affected by the number of its members, and it extends indeed its fruitful branches throughout the

p S. Cypr. De Unit. Eccl. iii.

whole world; its various streams are far and near diffused, but you may trace them all to a single fountain; they are all originally derived from one head, having all one original, and one fruitful mother was their common parent."

This unity is very clearly taught in the Holy Scriptures. First, in the prayer before alluded to immediately before our Lord's passion[q]; then in the expression, "one Lord, one faith, one baptism[r];" also in the description of its being our Lord's "Body," which essentially implies unity, ("there is one body, and one spirit.... until we come all to the unity of the faith[s];") and, lastly, in the descriptions of the Church, as His flock, His sheepfold, His kingdom. For both unity of faith and unity of society, which these expressions imply, are symbolised in the unity of the Church. The one truth requires one vehicle of its tradition, the society which was visibly to bear the image of the one Christ on earth.

Now unity may be divided into objective and subjective. Objective unity is that inwrought by our Head Jesus Himself, through union with Himself. It is wrought on His

[q] John xvii. [r] Eph. iv. 2, 5. [s] Eph. iv.

side, by the communication of the "one Spirit," and by the Sacraments, making us all one body in Him. It requires, on our part, continuity of the commission which He gave to His Apostles, and perseverance in the faith which He committed to the Church. Subjective unity is unity of will, and intercommunion with one another. Subjective unity may be suspended, while objective unity is maintained. Subjective unity was suspended during the schism at Antioch, yet objective unity was maintained, for the blessed Meletius is a saint. Subjective unity was suspended in the quarrels between the British and Western Churches in the Saxon times, yet nobody doubts of the salvation or sanctity of S. Aidan or S. Cuthbert. Subjective unity was suspended during the struggles of the antipopes, yet no one considers the followers of Peter de Luna as either heretics or schismatics. And this must also apply to the mighty dissension between the East and the West, and between ourselves and the rest of Christendom. It is deeply to be deplored that the state of the Church is as it is; but let us hope, that the evil is not so great as it seems, and that there is a fund of unity, if men only

understood each other, that the fissures are only surface ones, that the disorder is functional, not organic.

Holiness.

The next attribute of the Church is its holiness. The Church being one body with Christ, it follows that it must partake in His righteousness, to whom it is joined. As in the natural body, the perfection of the head prepares us for a corresponding perfection in the members, so the graces poured forth on the human nature of our Lord are reflected and imaged forth in His body. And indeed none can doubt that sanctity is a note of Christ's Church, for "He loved it, and gave Himself for it, that He might *sanctify* and cleanse it[t];" and the end of His coming is elsewhere stated to be, that "He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works[u]." This holiness may be considered as belonging to the Church as a whole, or as to her individual members. As a whole, the Church is holy, in that it retains faithfully those means of sanctification which Christ gave her, holy sacraments, holy laws, holy teaching, so that, amid whatever imperfection, her whole aim is, that the tendency

[t] Eph. v. 26. [u] Tit. ii. 14.

of her acts, and her teaching shall be to promote holiness and the inward spiritual life. The moral system of the Church will be such as to exhibit this; and accordingly we shall expect to find not only the highest cultivation of that which human nature is capable of, but also evidence of the special graces of God, such as our Lord promised should never be wanting to His own. And this high moral culture will be evidenced forth to us in the lives of holy persons, so that God will "be glorified in His saints, and admired in all them that believe;" and though the tares grow together to the harvest, and the kingdom of heaven is a net with both good and bad fishes in it, yet is there such external evidence of the fruits of faith and love, that the sanctity of its doctrine, of its members, of its saints, may be pointed to as external notes of the true bride of the Lord. And so the Church is actually holy in her individual members, in that those who most truly belong to her are so through faith and grace, and love of Christ, her Head. An university is learned, or a city rich, which abound in learning or riches, although there may be many unlearned or poor, and although the learned or rich may yet be short of the

ideal of learning or wealth. So the Church is holy in those her members, who, cleaving to Christ, have from Him "a[x] real infused sanctity," to be perfected in that wholly spotless purity, when, in the Resurrection, the Church, perfect in her children, shall be so "joined to Christ, that the Body too with the Head shall be full of beauty, clothed with immortality, radiant with brightness, blessed in fruition, established in glory, in love, in truth, in eternity, in peace, in praise, in exultation, in admiration, in thanksgiving, in light[y]."

Catholicity.

The third note of the Church is Catholicity or Universality. It was prophesied, that in the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that is, in Christ, all the nations should be blessed[z]. And in the Book of Psalms, the Eternal Father addresses the Son, "Desire of me, and I shall give thee the inheritance of the heathen, and the uttermost ends of the earth as thy possession." In accordance with this, our Lord prophesied that the Gospel should be preached in all the world[a]. Therefore sent He His Apostles "to preach the Gospel to

[x] Bp. Pearson. [y] S. Laur. Justinian. Lib. de Humil. fin.
[z] Gen. xii. 3. xxii. 18. xxvi. 4. xxviii. 14. collat. Act. iii. 25. Gal. iii. 9. [a] Matt. xxvi. 13. Mark xiv. 9.

every creature[b]," so that "their sound went forth into all lands, and their words unto the ends of the earth[c]." Even in St. Paul's time, he was able to speak of the Gospel, as being that "which is come unto you as it is in all the world[d]."

"It (the Church) is called Catholic, because it is throughout the world, from one end of the earth to the other; and because it teaches universally and completely one and all the doctrines which ought to come to men's knowledge, concerning things both visible and invisible, heavenly and earthly; and because it subjugates in order to godliness every class of men, governors and governed, learned and unlearned; and because it universally treats and heals every sort of sins, which are committed by soul and body, and possesses in itself every form of virtue which is named, both in deeds and words, and in every kind of spiritual gifts[e]." "In this Holy Catholic Church, receiving instruction and behaving ourselves virtuously, we shall attain the kingdom of heaven, and inherit eternal life; for which also

[b] Mark xvi. 15. Matt. xxviii. 19. [c] Rom. x. 18.
[d] Col. i. 6. [e] S. Cyril. Cat. xviii. 23.

we endure all toils, that we may be partakers of it in the Lord[f]."

This last note of Apostolicity is proved to us by our Lord's words, in giving her commission to His followers to found Churches throughout the world; "As my Father sent me, so send I you[g]." "Go, and make disciples, baptizing them[h]." And St. Paul admonishes the faithful as "being built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone[i]." St. John also tells us, that he saw the new Jerusalem, that is, the Church, "and the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb[k]." It implies, that besides the doctrine of the Apostles, there shall be a public perpetual and uninterrupted succession from the Apostles to us. From an early time this has been the test of a true Church. Tertullian[l] thus challenges the heretics of her day, "Let them exhibit the origins of their Churches, let them unfold the order of their Bishops, successively coming down from the beginning, so that their first Bishop should

Apostolicity.

[f] S. Cyril. Cat. xviii. 28. [g] John xx. 21. [h] Matth. xxviii. [i] Eph. ii. 20. [k] Apoc. xx. 14. [l] De Præscript. 32.

have as his author and predecessor one of the Apostles, or of those Apostolic men who were used to be with the Apostles. For in this way the Apostolic Churches bring down their lists."

And now it becomes us to say somewhat concerning the present unhappy condition of the Church of Christ. It is rent and torn. "Væ nobis quia peccavimus." The East is divided from the West, the Teutonic from the Romanesque race. Egypt and the shrivelled remains of Christianity in Southern Asia still wither in the Nestorian and Jacobite heresies: the active genius of the Greeks, in early times so energetic, has been chrystalized into a cold and lifeless ritualism. Russia, although yet converting nations to the faith of Christ, and yearly winning to Him heretics and heathens, is itself under an iron despotism of this world; the Roman Obedience by its exclusive claims has forced the rest of Christendom into an antagonistic position, from which itself too suffers: while the domination of the Anglosaxon race throughout the world, has perpetuated that system of lax discipline, and, in her members, often vague belief, which nevertheless has practically done its work well, and in the providence

of God seems to have a mission before it, which we term Anglicanism. Neither in our elements of Christianity must we entirely exclude those bodies which though not formally of the Body of Christ, yet profess the faith of Christ, and which (we may humbly hope) are in some sense of the soul of the Church, the great bodies of the Reformed Confessions. What a contrast is all this congeries of warring elements to what we should have expected from the prophecy and prayer of the Divine Jesus! What are we to say with regard to it? How are we to justify it?

One common solution naturally suggests itself. Each branch may declare itself to be the only true Church, condemning all others as heretics and schismatics. This has ever been common to all results of conviction. Calvinists regard all in the Greek and Roman Obedience as idolaters. The Greeks maintain that they are the one orthodox Apostolic Church, while the claims of the Church of Rome to exclusive Catholicity are too well known to be mentioned. Nay, even members of the English Church, who of all others, from circumstances, ought to desire the widest fraternization, while they condemn the Calvinists and Lutherans for want of a valid

succession, and the Romans and Greeks for want of what they term pure doctrine, seem to make themselves the only true Church of Christ. Now what is all this but the spirit of Donatism? Can this really satisfy the enlightened conscience of the Christian? How on this ground shall we account for the evident good that exists beyond our own system? Shall the Roman Catholic gainsay the grace which has been poured out on the Greek Obedience, so that nations of heathens or of heretics have since the schism been gathered into the faith in Christ? Shall the Anglican believe, that the merits of Carlo Borromeo, the most perfect type of the Christian bishop which the world ever saw, are as the evidence of grace in a man accidentally better than his system? Shall either Greek or Roman speak of the devout Ken, or George Herbert, or Launcelot Andrewes, as devils' blinds to keep men by a simulated disguise of goodness from what they term the true Church? Nay, shall men undervalue the unsacramental grace of those, who like Spener and Gerhard have adorned systems, which in their logical consequences, and generally in their practical results, have led to the most miserable consequences?

There is another practical solution, which

equally satisfies the intellect at the expense of the religious sense. It is, that all these religions are indifferent. That different forms of belief place no obstruction to real unity, and that the idea of Christianity implies very great latitude in the way in which truth presents itself to each man. In fact, this implies that theory of an invisible Church, which supposes that not only God's elect are to be found every where in all systems, but that the external communion is a matter of no importance. Now this idea is incompatible with a real belief in the Incarnation of the Word, for that Word has been made manifest; has become visible, and therefore must energize in some definite visible body. There are also distinct texts in Scripture which attach salvation to belonging to the One Body of Christ. There are certain outward conditions, such as Baptism, the Eucharist, common worship, and the like, which necessarily imply some visible body.

The truth then must be somewhere between these two theories. On the one hand, we must avoid Donatism; on the other, Latitudinarianism. Holy Scripture sets forth, what Christians, as individuals, or collectively as the living Body of Christ, ought to be; but it

does not say what degree of short-coming shall forfeit the blessings of the Gospel. The Church and her children in her were purchased by the Blood of God, that they should be holy, the temple of the Holy Ghost, full of love and peace and all other fruits of the Spirit. It was said of individuals, "By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another;" as much as it was said of the whole Church, "that they may be one as We are." It was said of every Priest, "The lips of the Priest should keep knowledge;" as much as it was said of the whole Church, "Thy teachers shall not be removed into a corner any more." Our Lord has promised, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world;" yet surely as much by the Spirit of Holiness, as by wisdom and teaching. Since then our Lord's promise was fulfilled in that dreary and hateful tenth century, when it was said, that although our Lord was in the boat, men were afraid to wake Him up, but rather wished that He might never awake to judge them; so may it be fulfilled now, although the fulness of His Presence may be abated through our divisions and want of love. We bear separate witness still to the One

Faith which He gave to His Church, the faith of the Creeds; we all look to Him, as truly present in His Sacraments, truly giving His own Body and Blood; we all hold to the Apostle's doctrine and fellowship, teaching those same truths which they taught, and holding sacred the descent from them. We are One Body, through the One Spirit, and all partaking of the One Body of Christ, all holding to the One Head. The Body is mangled, but, we believe, not severed, through loss of intercommunion. We are one, we trust, in One, although in some, even grave things, not at one with one another. If the Gospel had its full course, every priest should be holy, and "all the children" of the Church "taught by God." Our Lord has promised, "I am with you alway, even to the end of the world;" but He has not promised to be always present in the same degree or the same way. He is not with us, as He was with the Apostles, in that they were "full of the Holy Ghost," and they spake as "moved by the Holy Ghost," so that what they spake were the words of God, and have been, ever since, a fountain of truth to the Church of Christ, such as no words, since

spoken through men, are or can be. He has been with the Church, in different degrees, since, according to her faithfulness. His Presence was lessened, surely, when He gave over whole Churches to the Moslem apostasy. His Presence was lessened, when He had given a nation, once the glory of the Church, to set up the goddess of reason. Every where He is present, in every office exercised in His Name; He regenerates; He confirms; He absolves; He consecrates; He ordains; He preserves the truth; He teaches those who will receive it.

And even where the conditions of holy Scripture are violated through invincible ignorance, or from insufficient exposition of the truth, or from constraining circumstances, we may trust that the chalice of God's grace will overflow. Even under the old law we see men not in covenant with God, and not of His Israel, the recipients of His grace, and the objects of His favour. But though Job and Melchizedech were not of the chosen seed, yet "salvation was of the Jews." There was an election, but others were blessed beyond it. It is safer for us to widen the pale of God's kingdom, than to deny the fruits of the Spirit.

We are not called to judge any man. We have to maintain our convictions, and to condemn the error, while we love the erring.

It is best too to acknowledge our disjointed and unhappy condition, rather than to shape the Gospel into a theory that suits us. We had better acknowledge, that for the sins of Christendom, subjective unity is suspended, and that while God has done great things for us, we have not co-operated therewith. We should not bandy the blame from one another, but we should strive and pray to remedy it, every good deed in all branches, and every venture of faith tending to the reorganization of the whole. Above all, making unity our daily prayer, beseeching God of His infinite mercy to behold and visit us, and to gather again His scattered sheep in this naughty world, that they may be saved through Christ for ever. One effect of our unhappy divisions is, that we cannot meet, even to heal them. Until we long more for unity, we cannot take even the first visible steps towards it, and union in heart must precede union in visible act. As God's Holy Spirit fills the river of God, it will, in all its several channels, overflow its banks, until they meet in one vast sea of the knowledge and of the love of God.

XVII.

OF THE REMISSION OF SIN.

I ACKNOWLEDGE ONE BAPTISM FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS.

THERE are here two propositions: 1. that Baptism is one; 2. that Baptism is for the remission of sins.

The Fathers of Constantinople had to warn the Church against the sacrilege of a repetition of baptism. As the natural birth can only take place once, so the spiritual birth cannot be repeated. Baptism once conferred is indelible; it confers what is termed *character*, which can never be effaced, however completely the grace of regeneration may be sinned away. A baptized man cannot become unbaptized; and if he sin unto death, his baptismal character remains in condemnation of him. His obligations last, though he may

have failed to perform them. He will not be treated as an offending stranger, but as a perjured friend.

But the mind of the Church was in doubt as to what was true baptism or not. It was questionable whether heretics could initiate into the true Church. In early times this matter perplexed the Church; and accordingly, we find a canon of Nicæa commanding rebaptization in the case of the Paulianists and Cataphrygians. So much hanging upon the validity of an ordinance, which cannot and must not be reiterated under pain of sacrilege, the Church has wisely enacted a form of conditional baptism, to be used in all doubtful cases[b].

Now this Article is one that has lately occupied much of the thoughts of English Churchmen, as it has been the point upon which the subservience of the English Church to the State has been most clearly brought out. A doctrine virtually disjoining the grace from the Sacrament, has by the civil power, that is,

[b] The mind of the Greek Church leant rather to the stricter side; and it is the opinion of the learned Dr. Routh, that this expression, "one baptism," is not an assertion against rebaptization, but a mere enunciation of the words of St. Paul's Epistle, "one baptism." See Opus c. vol. iii.

by the vis hæreseos of a large body within her pale, been forced upon the Church. It is interesting to ask, how this error has obtained so fatal a position among us, for it is an error that finds little support from the divines of the Reformation. No doubt, passages may be found vague in expression, anticipating the stronger statements of the Puritans; but the language of the Reformers is in the main perfectly orthodox on this subject. It is true that they formed a most unholy connection with the foreign Protestants, whose system had within it the germs of all disbelief, but they themselves firmly believed this doctrine[a]. How then came the opposite error to creep so stealthily among us? Now much may be said of the downward tendency of doctrine; but may it not have been, that they who held the doctrine in the most orthodox form, have somewhat to answer for in this matter. They taught the truth, it is true, but they neither traced the truth from on high, nor carried it out into its legitimate practical consequences. They could not tell "whence it came, or whither it went." They did not trace the doctrine from the one great Baptizer, Jesus

[a] See Britton's Horæ Sacramentales.

Christ; they did not shew how spirit having become joined to matter in the mystery of the Incarnation, these two conjoined were to be for the healing of the nations; they did not teach in its fulness the great Sacramental system, which forms the key to all the many blessed ways in which the Almighty deals with us; and, on the other hand, they did not carry out the doctrine to its necessary consequences. They taught, that high grace was given in baptism, but they did not teach how when lost that grace was to be regained: they taught, that the man was justified, but they did not shew how that justification was preserved or restored: they taught, that we were made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven, but they did not shew how when such an one had sinned, he was to regain his lost privileges. In short, they neglected to teach that penitence is the second plank, whereon those who have been washed off the ark of the Church may be saved. To preach baptismal regeneration without preaching penitence, was to preach a doctrine either calculated to excite undue hopes, or to plunge into undue despair. Either one was so high, that there was no fear of a fall,

or there was nothing to save in the event of such a catastrophe. The consequence was, that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration ceased to be practical, and the earnest but ignorant founders of the Evangelical School, as it is called, naturally threw over a system that impeded them in their work, because misunderstood both by themselves and their adherents. And till these two points are more insisted on, on the one hand, that Baptism is closely connected with the Incarnation, and so intimately bound up in the actions of the Son of God; and, on the other hand, till more prominence is given to penitence in all its forms and aspects, contrition, confession, amendment, absolution, fruits meet for repentance, corrective alms-deeds, self-discipline, the bringing under of the body, this doctrine will retain its unreal aspect, and though the word of Scripture and the express teaching of the Church may make it impossible to be in so many words denied, yet it will not be a living and life-giving truth.

Now Baptism is the origin of the spiritual life, the gate whereby the Church is entered, and that whereby a right is acquired to all the privileges of Christianity. By it we become members of Christ, children of God, and in-

heritors of the kingdom of heaven. As by sin death hath passed upon all men, so unless we be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, we cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. It is termed in Scripture the laver of regeneration [b], and is termed by the Fathers the Sacrament of water, of the new life, of faith, of illumination, of the second birth.

The principal cause of Baptism is the Holy Trinity; the instrumental cause, he who administers it; the matter is water; and the form is, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.' These are the essentials of Baptism, and without these, Baptism is not valid. S. Augustine [c] says, "What is the Baptism of Christ? It is the washing of water in the word. Take away the water, it is not Baptism; take away the word, it is not Baptism."

As regards the matter, it is a matter of indifference whether the water be cold or hot, fresh or salt, so that it be natural water. It is invalid if conferred with any other liquid.

Baptism was originally generally administered by way of immersion; the catechumen was dipped three times [d].

[b] Tit. iii. [c] Tract. xv. in Joh. x. 4. [d] Bingham, iii. p. 598.

But, although our Church still prescribes immersion where the child can bear it, she is satisfied to administer it by affusion or aspersion. This has been permitted from the earliest times in the baptism of clinics; and although these afterwards were ineligible to offices in the Church, it was not from any doubt of the validity of their baptism, but because it was such a bad sign in a man putting off the responsibilities of the Christian state till late in life, that such persons were prejudged not to have a vocation for the Christian ministry. Since the thirteenth century, affusion has been the universal custom of the Western Church, except in the diocese of Milan, and many early monuments of the Church shew the existence of the practice[e]; and affusion should be trine, but this is not of necessity to the validity of the ordinance: it is however highly to be recommended, both as giving greater security for the ablution, and also as symbolizing that adorable Trinity into Whom the child is baptized.

The form of Baptism, as above mentioned, is essential to the valid administration of the ordinance[f]: the only tolerated variation is that

[e] Martene de Antiq. Rit. i. c. i.

[f] S. Thos. iii. a. 66. art. xiv. §. 5. and art. xviii. ord. 17.

of the Greek Church. "N. the servant of God, is baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:" this seems to have been ordered to refute the error of those who attributed the virtue of the baptism to the administrator, as the chief cause, in the spirit of the schismatical Corinthians, who said, 'I am of Paul, I am of Cephas.'

Of the minister of Baptism.

On these subjects there is little controversy. We now come to a question which divides orthodox divines within the Anglican Communion, who can be the administrator or minister of Baptism? Some learned theologians maintain it to be a priestly act; others maintain that any one may baptize. The question is eminently practical, for it involves the question of the validity of the baptism of dissenters and presbyterians, their so-called orders being invalid, as lacking the Apostolic succession. On the one hand it is urged, that the Church being a society or corporation, no one can initiate a member into it, but one of the proper office bearers; that the right to baptize implies the right to teach; that Scripture gives no evidence of the permissibility; that S. Cyprian, Firmilian, and Basil, have by implication condemned it. On the other hand, it is urged, that

in a question so necessary to salvation, the widest permission is the most consonant with the mercy of God; that as in cases of necessity a layman may teach, so he may baptize; that the silence of Scripture throws us necessarily back upon the tradition of the Church, which is in favour of the laxer practice. Tertullian[g], S. Jerome[h], S. Augustine[i], advocating it; and even the Council of Elvira[k], with two restrictions, permitting it.

The validity of Baptism by women is more doubtful. In cases of necessity, the Roman Church allows it, justifying her practice by the arguments before cited; but then it must be recollected, that Tertullian expressly forbids it[l]. S. Epiphanius[m] condemns the Marcionites and Pepuzians for practising it; and the 100th canon of the fourth Council of Carthage, A. D. 436, at which S. Augustine himself was present, forbad it[n].

[g] De Baptismo, 17.
[h] Dial. contra Lucifer, n. 9.
[i] Cont. Epist. Parmen. lib. ii. 29.
[k] Can. 38.
[l] De Virg. Velan. 9. but see note n. p. 305.
[m] Hær. 42. §. 4.
[n] But perhaps the persons condemned may have practised it, without reference to an emergency. In all cases where immediate death is apprehended before a lawful minister can be called, it is the safer side for any sufficiently informed person to administer it.

The question, who may be baptized, has agitated the Christian world since the Reformation. Anabaptists maintained, that infants, because incapable of reason, and therefore of faith, ought not to undergo this rite. They urge, that there is no command for it in Scripture, and that in the third and fourth centuries it was usual to delay this ordinance. The Church, on the other hand, has maintained the contrary, believing that though not expressly mentioned in Scripture, its use is insinuated, in the words, "now are they holy," applied to Christian children; in the broad assertion, "Except a man be born of water;" and in those places, where whole households, such as that of Lydia, Stephanus, and St. Paul's gaoler were illuminated. The constant tradition of the Church also is in its favour. S. Augustine says[o], "The Church has always done this, always held it; this she received from the faith of the Fathers: this she will keep stedfastly unto the end." Irenæus says, "Christ came to save all by Himself; all, I say, who by Him are born again unto God, infants, children, young men, and old ones[p]."

Of the subject of Baptism.

The great number of infants who die before

Of its necessity.

[o] Serm. 176. De Verb. Ap. 1 Tim. vi. [p] Hær. lib. ii. c. 22. (al. 38.) §. 4. So also S. Jerome, Dial. adv. Pelag. l. iii. 17.

coming to the use of reason, and the strong view which the Church has always taken with regard to the absolute necessity of Baptism, have no doubt been the reasons for the practice of infant Baptism. Of that necessity there can be no doubt. Our Lord's words are very decided, "Go, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them[q]." "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." So also[r], "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." And St. Thomas[s] gives a theological reason for this, that no one can obtain salvation who is not made a member of Christ; and no one can become a member of Christ, unless actually, or in will at least, he have undergone Baptism.

For in regard to the absolute necessity of Baptism, two important qualifications have always been observed by the Church. Martyrdom, or the Baptism of Blood, and that determination and will to be baptized, joined with a perfect contrition and conversion of the soul to God, which is termed the Baptism of the Spirit, have always been regarded as supplying the place of the Baptism of water. How God

[q] Matt. xxviii. 19. Mark xvi. 25. [r] John iii. 5.
[s] 3a. qu. 68. 1.

will judge the heathen who know Him not, is not for us to enquire: but what shall be said of that sect among Christians, much distinguished by outward decorum and sagacious practical benevolence, who in the face of the clear injunction of God, the practice of the early Church, the consent of the whole Christian world and the deep-rooted conviction of all who know the name of Christ, deliberately deny the necessity of the Sacrament of Baptism?

Of the effect of Baptism.

That any external act should work a change on the spiritual condition is no doubt a great trial of faith, and accordingly we find from very early times doubts expressed as to the efficacy of baptism. The Manichees held, that it brought no salvation to any one; and some Protestants have regarded it merely as an initiation into the visible Church. Others, viewing it from a different light, have held, that the graces accompanying it cannot be lost. The Church however holds, that the principal effects of Baptism are fourfold. 1. That therein is given the grace of justification and sanctification, whereby all sin, whether original or actual, is remitted. 2. The remission of the punishment due to sin is entirely effected. 3. Our adoption into membership in the Church,

whereby we require a right to the other ordinances of religion, is given to us. 4. A mark or character is impressed upon us, so that we cannot become unbaptized again, the impression being indelible. A difference exists between the Roman and Anglican Churches, as to the degree of the destruction of original sin in the regenerate. The former holds, that God hates nothing in the regenerate, and that every thing of the nature of sin (properly and truly) is removed thereby. The latter holds, that the infection of the nature remains even in the regenerate. The difference is a verbal one; for the Council of Trent allows, that the *fomes peccati*, which it confessed, remained in the baptized, is called sin by the Apostle, because it proceeds from sin and leads to sin.

XVIII.

OF THE RESURRECTION.

I LOOK FOR THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

THE resurrection of the dead in other Creeds is more emphatically termed, the resurrection of the flesh; for this is the fact to which our holy faith bears witness. Heathenism, corrupt as it was, had preserved the tradition of an immortality of the soul; her pure etherial substance carried within itself an argument for its indestructibility; amid the islands of the blest, fanned by ocean breezes, she was to pass a tearless eternity, but it was reserved for Christianity to proclaim the resurrection of the body; that these dry bones should live; that in our flesh we should see God.

He who in the beginning made us out of the dust of the earth, is not unable, when in obedience to His command we are again resolved and turned into earth, to raise us again from it. And

it is the only solution of many difficulties with regard to the providence of God. Were there no resurrection, 'let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' Were there no resurrection, in what should we be better than the brutes that perish. Were there no resurrection, God were unjust; for we see the wicked on earth flourishing like a green bay tree, and the holy and the good the subjects of many calamities. Were there no resurrection, we must doubt the interference of a continual Providence. And that this is not a resurrection of the soul only, seems clear, first, that as the soul sinned or obeyed in the body, it is fitting that it should be rewarded or punished in the same. And this is clear from Holy Scripture. For under the patriarchal law we find God requiring or asking back again the blood of each man, even from the beasts[a]: and so in Isaiah we are told, 'they that are in the graves shall hear:' and so in Ezekiel, we have the awful type of the dry bones: and so in Daniel we read, 'many of them that sleep in the dust shall arise.' And the same thing is said by our Lord; and the resurrection of Lazarus was especially given to confirm the faith of believers in this, as it was

[a] Gen. v.

given at the time so near His Passion, to strengthen the disciples in that trying hour.

But above all, His own resurrection is the greatest proof of this mighty doctrine. For the Lord is the first-fruits of them that slept. Concerning which the Apostle says, "If the dead rise not, then is not Christ risen: therefore your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins: but now is Christ risen from the dead, the first-fruits of them that slept, and the firstborn from the dead." And also, "If we believe that Jesus is dead and is risen again, so will God bring those that sleep by Jesus with Him." Our resurrection then and Christ's resurrection are similar. And that this was a real resurrection, we find from our Lord's command to Thomas to touch Him. But though our very bodies shall rise again, they shall rise differently from our present bodies, for they shall be as the Lord's body; as the Apostle says, "our conversation is in heaven, from whence we wait our Saviour Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile bodies into conformity with His glorious body, according to His mighty working."

2. S. Thomas says, that beatitude being the ultimate end of man, which he cannot attain in this life, the Lord has ordained that he shall

attain it in the next world, which is eternal. But man to obtain beatitude must obtain it in his integrity, and that integrity consisting both of body and soul, he must obtain the end of this being in body and soul also[c]. Now this rising again is purely supernatural, proceeding from the resurrection of Jesus Christ, for all divine gifts are given to man by means of the humanity of Jesus Christ; so that as we cannot be freed from the death of the Spirit but by the gift of grace, given us from God to man, (by the incarnation of the Word, full of grace and truth,) so we cannot be delivered from the death of the body but by a resurrection caused by the Divine power. The manhood of Christ will be the mighty instrument, whereby "bone to bone, and sinew to sinew," the bodies of the dead shall be joined together again, and reunited to the souls in which they sinned or wrought righteousness, and thus they shall stand before the tribunal of God. "So shall it be in the end of the world; the holy Angels shall go forth, and separate the bad from the good, and cast them into a furnace of fire[d]."

Time of the resurrection.

The time of the general resurrection has

[c] Suppl. qu. 75. art. 3. 64. [d] Matt. xiii. 9.

naturally occupied much of the thoughts of devout Christians. We learn from holy Scripture, that this shall take place before the end of the world. "This is the will of Him that sent Me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day[e]." "The harvest is the end of the world[f]." A verse in the Apocalypse[g] has occasioned much controversy; "And I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Christ . . . and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." This has given rise to the Millenarians, who hold that the first resurrection should be that of those who were to have a temporal reign with Christ of a thousand years. Some of the early Fathers of the Church inclined to this view, and some modern sects have made it a prominent point in their doctrine. But as this is said in the Apocalypse to precede the Judgment, which is mentioned after this in the same chapter at v. 11, 12. it seems safer, on the theory that the souls of those who have died for Christ do already enjoy the beatific vision, to understand by the thousand years an indefinite time between their death

[e] John vi. 40. [f] Matt. xiii. 39. [g] Rev. xx. 4. 8.

and the general resurrection. And this interpretation would also apply to the thousand years in which Satan is said to be bound; meaning the time from the death of our Lord to the consummation of the age; it being generally believed, that since the coming of Christ, the manifestation of the diabolic powers have not been so common.

These subjects, however, are involved in great mystery; and it is a peril to reverence, and a scandal to religion, to mark out the dates at which unfulfilled prophecy is to be accomplished. Our own times have shewn the discomfiture of several popular theories on this subject. The Christian should recollect, that "it is not for us to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in His own power[h]." Indeed, so mysterious are these things, that we are told, "that of that day and of that hour knoweth no man, no not the Angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only[i];" which means, that even the Son, in that He was man, knew not these things. Of one practical thing, however, we are assured, that "the Son of Man shall come as a thief in the night;" and that "as it was in the days of Noah, so it

[h] Acts i. 7. [i] Matt. xiii. 32.

shall be" at His coming; men shall be taken by surprise in the midst of all their worldliness and sin; and though it may be that to those who search diligently, some hints of His coming may by revelation be vouchsafed, yet "of that day and of that hour knoweth no man."

XIX.

OF THE LIFE OF THE WORLD TO COME.

AND THE LIFE OF THE WORLD TO COME. AMEN.

AFTER the judgment, there exist but two states of being. They that have done good, shall be in everlasting happiness; they that have done evil, in everlasting fire. The first is the reward of those who have cooperated with the grace of God, the last is the desert of those who by resisting it have incurred His anger. There is then a heaven and a hell, and each of these is everlasting.

Hell. Now by hell we understand in this sense that state in which the devils and the reprobates are eternally tormented. Two points with regard to it are of faith, viz. its existence, and its eternity; all other questions as to its place, and as to the nature and quality of its punishments, are matters of opinion[a]; yet the general sense of the Church inclines to believe in a material fire.

[a] See Petavius de Angelis, lib. iii. c. 5.

The eternity of the punishments of the future world hath been doubted by heretics from a very early time. The disciples of Origen, and some Misericordes, mentioned by S. Augustine[b], have been succeeded in this belief by many Socinians and Protestants. One sect, called the Universalists, maintain it as their distinguishing dogma, and in reaction from the sternness of Calvinism, it has worked itself out among some of the sects of that error. As every heresy is said to be the unhealthy action of some suppressed truth working itself up to the surface, or the reaction against a prevailing error, may not the predominating doubt of the eternity of hell arise either from men having denied too absolutely any purifying process in the intermediate state, or from the mind of man revolting against the gloom of the Calvinian theory of predestination, and betaking itself to the false sentimentalism of this dangerous error?

Origen's opinions on this subject are said to have been condemned by the fifth General Council of Constantinople, (A.D. 533,) and it may be against him that the words of the Athanasian Creed were directed, "They that

[b] Civ. Dei. lxxi. 17.

have done good shall go into everlasting life, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire." Holy Scripture seems explicit enough on this terrible truth. We have first the assertion of the eternity of the punishment conveyed by the use of the word αἰώνιος, as, "Many of those that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and to everlasting contempt[c]." "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels[d]." In all which passages it must be observed, that the duration of pain is made correlative with the duration of bliss.

Then we have those texts which imply the negative of any termination of punishment. "Their worm shall not die, nor their fire be quenched[e]."

Lastly, we have those texts which apply to the immutability of the punishment. "If the tree fall toward the south or toward the north, in the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be[f]." "Whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever shall speak a word against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be remitted, either in this

[c] Dan. xii. 2. [d] Matt. xxv. 41. cf. etiam 46.
[e] Is. lxvi. 24. Matt. iii. 12. Mark ix. 42. [f] Eccles. xi. 3.

world, or in the world to come[g]." And of the same form are such expressions as, "vessels of wrath;" "vessels fit for destruction;" "the wrath of God remaineth on them;" "they shall not obtain the kingdom of God."

Although some others have followed a little too closely in the steps of Origen, yet the common consent of the tradition of the Church is very clear on this subject. Clemens Romanus says[h], "The souls punished with a sempiternal pain of unextinguishable fire, never dying to their great misfortune, can find no end." So Tertullian[i].

Eternity of punishment.

As this error is very prevalent at present, is supported by many grave authors, and commends itself to many amiable persons, who allow their ideas of the love of God to efface within their minds the recollection of His justice, it is well to fix the mind upon some of the difficulties that have been brought forward.

No doubt it is a startling truth, that God should punish infinitely finite crimes, and all our prepossessions would persuade us to deny what it is so disagreeable to believe as this. Accordingly we find very many objections

[g] Matt. xii. 32. [h] Ap. Damasc. in Ecl. cit. Petav. de Aug. iii. 8. cf. Recog. Clem. v. 28. [i] Apolog. c. 48.

started. Some would understand by the eternity of hell, the total destruction and annihilation of the wicked, quoting such expressions as, destruction and death, eternal death, &c. But they who quote these expressions must recollect, that there are other words, such as fire, gnashing of teeth, outer darkness, and the worm, which destroy the possibility of the idea of annihilation. "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord[k]." And in the Apocalypse, the second death is described to be "the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone[l]." Others maintain, that the word αἰώνιος, eternal, merely means a very long time, as in St. Jude, where the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrha "are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." But it must be recollected, that the word does not stand alone, but that various other epithets are used which determine its signification; as, "without end," "unquenchable," "that never dieth," and the like, while it must be recollected, that it is the same word which is applied to the bliss of the saints. It is true, that the word is sometimes used for a very

[k] 2 Thess. i. 9. [l] Rev. xxi. 8.

long time, as in the place of Jude[m]; but it is so used, first, as applied to the eternal destruction of the wicked inhabitants; and, secondly, to the indelible signs it has left to this day: in both which respects it is a type of the eternal punishment which awaits the wicked, as the inspired author actually enforces on us.

Others have quoted the texts, "Will God cut off for ever[n]?" "He will not always chide, neither will He keep His anger for ever[o]." "And they shall be gathered together as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison, and after many days shall they be visited[p]." In answer to this we must say, that these texts must not be thus applied; they refer to the punishment of sinners in this life, and to the vengeance which He takes on earth in mercy, it being better for us to be chastened here than hereafter. Besides, it is very doubtful whether the visitation alluded to in the last citation be not a visitation of punishment.

Others have objected, why should a finite sin have an infinite punishment? To this S. Thomas answers, that all sin has something of infinity in it, seeing that it is measured as an offence

[m] ver. 7. [n] Ps. lxxvi. 7. [o] Ps. ciii. 9. [p] Is. xxiv. 22.

against the infinite Majesty of God[q]; and the whole theory of the probation and trial of man which this life is, and the analogy of the great waste that takes place in physical nature, all presuppose the eternity of the awards of the next world[r].

But some regarding the love of Christ, cannot understand His enduring the damnation of any one soul which He had created. He was to "see of the travail of His soul, and be satisfied." Can He be satisfied, while one poor wretch is burning? and the bright promises of the New Testament—"As in Adam *all* die, even so in Christ shall *all* be made alive"—"God shall be all in *all*"—"the time of the restitution of *all* things must come"—"behold, I make all things new"—imply, that though God in His mercy has threatened these punishments, yet He will not surely exact them? To this we must answer, that the state of the lost excludes repentance, which alone for the merits of Christ will recover those who have been baptized and have sinned; the guilt of hell will be a continually progressive guilt, for "He that is filthy, shall be filthy still;" and in Christ the merciful, we must also see Christ the just. And the bright things that are here said,

[q] Suppl. 3. qu. 99. a. 1. [r] Butler's Analogy.

are said of the new world of the saints, of that blessed recreation of all things, in which be it our daily prayer that we be made partakers.

All these theories arise from an inadequate view of the attributes of God; we cannot tell how He hates sin, and therefore we cannot imagine how it can need eternal punishment. Again, they rise from an improper idea of the future pleasure and pain. If Beatitude consist in the enjoyment of God, damnation in the loss of Him, how shall the wicked be able to enter such a joy? Man being free, actually by sin unfits himself for the enjoyment of good, and would not enjoy it even if it was placed within his reach; how then, on the theory of a temporary hell, in a state which is confessedly only punitive and not purgatorial, can he acquire those dispositions, which alone could make him enjoy heaven? The guilt remains for ever, for guilt cannot be remitted without grace, which man cannot obtain after death, nor ought the punishment to cease while the guilt remains[s]. It is his own doing, as well as God's justice, that his punishment is eternal. He has voluntarily cast away from him good, and God in His justice is not bound to restore it to him.

[s] Summ. Theol. ad loc.

Opinions with regard to hell.

We said above, that only two points were of faith on the subject of hell, its existence, and its eternity: yet reverent minds have enquired both as to its place, and the nature of its punishments. Of the former of these, S. Chrys. says[t], "But you will ask me in what place it is? Beyond all this world, as I think." S. Greg. Nyssen held it to be in the darkness of this world, of which the devils are rulers, according to the words of the Apostle[u]. Others, as St. Thomas, hold, that it is under the earth[x]; a thought confirmed by Numbers xvi. 31. Psalm xxx. 3.

On the subject of the nature of the pains of hell, theologians generally divide these into the *pœna sensus* and the *pœna damni*. The fire which is the great instrument of the *pœna sensus* has by some been supposed to be a metaphor for the stings of conscience, but the common opinion is, that it is a material fire. "For as fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell[y]." "All darkness shall be hid in his secret places, a fire not blown shall consume him[z]." "Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? Who

[t] Hom. 31. Ep. ad Rom. [u] Eph. vi. 12. [x] Opusc. 9. art. 24. [y] Deut. xxxii. 22. [z] Job xx.

among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings[z]?" "I am tormented in this flame[a]." "The fire is not quenched[b]." "For the creature that serveth Thee who art the Maker, increaseth his strength against the unrighteous for their punishment[c]." And God, who makes Himself marvellous in sinners, will cause this fire to affect ever the souls of the guilty, for "in that one fire the wicked shall endure every torment in hell."

And with this shall be the worm, which some of the Fathers believe to be a material worm, others the remorse of conscience more aweful than any fire or darkness. "And they, repenting and groaning for anguish of speech, shall say within themselves . . . Therefore have we erred from the way of truth, and the light of righteousness hath not shined upon us, and the Sun of righteousness rose not on us. We wearied ourselves in the way of wickedness and destruction . . . what hath pride profited us, or what good hath riches with our vaunting brought us[d]?" And the devils will torment them, and they shall be in "a land of darkness, as darkness itself, and of the shadow of death,

[z] Is. xxxiii. 14. [a] Luke xvi. 24. [b] Is. lxvi. 24.
[c] Wisd. xvi. 24. [d] Wisd. v. 3, 6, 7, 8.

without any order, and where the light is as darkness[e]." "And their stink shall come up out of their carcases[f]." "And there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth."

But aweful as these pains may be, they are as nothing to the *pœna damni*, the loss of God. Here we know not what it is to be made for God, and to lose Him. There the wicked shall learn what it is to be deprived of Him. "As the highest happiness consists intellectually in the sight of God, and affectively in the adherence of the will to the Supreme Will, so the extreme of human misery will consist in the mind being entirely deprived of the Divine Light, and in the affection being obstinately turned away from God[g]." God Himself, in Whom are all good things, is our exceeding great reward, and separation from Him is therefore the height of misery. Here men blinded by sin care not to be near God: Depart from us, say they, for we desire not a knowledge of thy ways; but in that day the intellect will be so far enlightened, as to apprehend the misery of having lost Him, of having lost Him by their own will. Then with every evil will, remaining obstinate in guilt, ever and

[e] Job x. 22. [f] Is. xxxiv. 3. [g] S. Thos. Opusc. ii. c. 174.

ever sinning, wishing for annihilation but obtaining it not, they will hate and blaspheme God for ever.

It remains for us to consider that other life of the world to come, which is in store for the good, the end for which man was created. Even natural religion and heathen philosophy arrived at the conclusion, that there was an end for which man was made. Some placed it in the exercise of virtue, others in the pursuit of pleasure; some in living according to nature, others in soaring above the world in the calm regions of philosophic thought. A few placed it in the conquest of the lower nature, and in absorption into the Pantheistic God of nature; but none came nearer to the very truth, that beatitude consists in the knowledge and possession, in the sight and love, of Him who is the Supreme Good, who is the one end and object of every intelligent nature, and who alone can satisfy the longings of the soul. Heaven.

Beatitude then must be taken in two senses; either as the object by the possession of which we become blessed, or as the act by which we do become so. In one sense God is Beatitude, in the other sense to see and possess Him is so. Now that the Blessed in their heavenly home

do supernaturally by intuition behold the essence of God, may be proved from Holy Scripture. Our Lord says of little children[h], "their angels do always behold the Face of my Father which is in heaven;" and of men in the future life, that "they shall be as the angels of God[i]," or, as it is written elsewhere[k], they are equal unto the angels. If then the angels see God in the face, the saints do so also. Elsewhere S. Paul says[l], "Now we see as in a glass darkly, but then face to face."

S. Augustine[m] says, "Man cannot see the face of God, but the angels even of the least in the Church always behold It; and now we see as in a glass and darkly, but then face to face, when from men we are promoted to an equality with angels."

Yet we may ask with S. Chrysostom[n], How can a created nature behold that which is increate? and our answer is, that It may be seen by them, but not comprehended; it may be seen, not by the force of the created nature, but by the *light of glory*, which some theologians believe to be none other than the very Spirit

[h] Matt. xviii. 10. [i] Matt. xxii. 30. [k] Luke xx. 36. [l] 1 Cor. xiii. 12. [m] Ep. cxlviii. n. 7. [n] Hom. xv. in S. Joan.

of God, intimately enlightening the minds of the Blessed. God is incomprehensible even by the saints in glory, for "He is great in council and mighty in work[o]," and "His ways are past finding out[p]." For to reach God by the mind in the smallest degree is great bliss, but to comprehend Him is entirely impossible.

And this vision of God will be brighter, as we have cooperated with the grace that He hath given us here. His glory has ever been the same, for it is eternal; He changes not, but all shall not see Him in the same degree, but as the light of glory is in divers degrees communicated to each one: "In my Father's house are many mansions[q]." "There is one glory of the sun, another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory: so is the resurrection of the dead." On which passages Tertullian thus comments[r]: "How are there many mansions with the Father, if not for the variety of desert; how can one star differ from another star, but by the variety of the rays?" So also the Apostle[s]; "Every man shall receive his own reward according to his

[o] Jer. xxxii. 19. [p] Rom. xi. 33. [q] John xiv. 2.
[r] Scorpiaco, c. 6. [s] 1 Cor. iii. 8.

own labour." And, "he that soweth little, shall reap little; he that soweth bountifully, shall reap also bountifully[t]."

"And yet though the saints see God in divers measures, yet one is not more blessed than another, nor does one enjoy the supreme good more than another, nor does one envy another; for though there be different degrees of glory, there is one degree of happiness; and all seek only what they have, and all burn with perfect charity, being plenarily conformed to the will of God. God is to such a degree all in all, that since He is love, what each one has is as it were communicated to the rest. Each one has what he has not, in that he has it in his brother; and yet shall there be no envy of the divine glory, since in all the unity of love shall reign[u]."

A question has arisen, *when* do the blessed behold the Face of God? Calvinists hold, that all who are saved are immediately without any intermediate condition placed in the highest heavens[x]. The Roman Church asserts, that they who have never sinned after their baptism, and that they who either in the body or out of the body have been cleansed from sin, are at

[t] Vulg. *in benedictionibus.* [u] Aug. [x] Confession of Faith, 32, 1.

once taken into heaven, and see the Triune God as He is[y]. The Greek Church holds, that the souls remain in a certain rest till after the day of judgment, when in conjunction with their risen bodies they attain everlasting bliss. The Anglican Church, so far as it has any definite opinion on the subject, seems to hold with this last doctrine. A question similar to this was agitated between the Dominicans and some Minorites in the time of John XXII, the latter holding that the blessed behold only the manhood of Christ till after the resurrection.

Beatific vision.

The primary object then, which is beheld by the saints in heaven, is the Beatific Vision of God, "whom no man hath seen or can see," as the Apostle says[z]. Not by the natural eye or by the powers of nature is He seen, for He is a pure Spirit, but "in His light shall we see light[a]." In this "we shall see Him as He is[b];" that is, we shall see Him with all His attributes, absolute and relative; but besides this, all God's creatures are secondary objects of the Beatific Vision, which the saints see in God and in His Word. And this the Fathers divide into the morning and the vesper cognition[c]; the morning cogni-

[y] Conc. Flor. def. [z] 1 Tim. vi. 16. S. Thos. Supp. q. 92.
[a] Ps. xxxvi. 9. [b] 1 John iii. 2. [c] Aug. de Civ. Dei, xi. 7.

tion is that which they have of objects in the Word and Wisdom of God; the vesper or evening cognition, which is less clear, is that which they have, out of God, by themselves or by divine revelation; such as are the mysteries of faith, which here seen dimly, shall there be made known; as it is written, "we all with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory," or their own condition, for they see all things in the mirror of the divinity, and what can they be ignorant of, who in their degree know Him who knoweth all things[d]; or the glories of their fellow citizens; or the causes of the operations of nature; or our prayers[e]; or our fortunes[f]; or ought else which God reveals to them.

And such is God, that to see Him is to love Him, and therefore Beatific Love is a constraining necessity of the saints in heaven. So wrapt are their wills, that a sweet and holy need compels them ever to love Him; and they "rest not day and night, saying, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty, Who wast, and art, and art to come[g]." And this sight of God

[d] Greg. Dial. 11. 33. [e] Apoc. v. 8. [f] Luke xv. 7. 1 Cor. xiii. 9. [g] Apoc. iv. 18.

taketh away all power of sinning, for the deceit which all sin implies is revealed by that Vision of Truth, and joy shall be theirs for ever; for happiness to be complete implies eternity, and that happiness consists in the enjoyment of Him who is eternal.

After this, it were needless to speak of the gifts of body and soul accorded to the saints, of the place of heaven which St. Paul describes as the third heaven, above the air, and the starry firmament; neither shall we speak of the golden crowns, the palm branches, nor yet of that special prerogative, the Aureola, which crowns the rest of all God's graces[h]. All these things surpass the intellect of man; and "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the thought of man to conceive, what things God hath prepared for them that love;" yet the thought of them, faint and imperfect though it be, is that which crowns virtue, dignifies humility, gilds the lowliest lot, and turns the saddest passages of life into a blessed preparation for heaven.

Non nostri jam dominatur corruptio mortaliter viventibus, et cum ipsâ æternâ vitâ manentibus. Neque enim indigebimus illic

[h] Apoc. xiv. 4. vii. 14.

vestimento, ubi erimus immortalitate vestiti; nec cibus nobis deerit, quando Ipse Panis vivus, Qui propter nos de cælo descendit Sui præsentiâ animas nostras satiabit; nec potus nobis deerit, præsenti Fonte vitæ. "Saturabit enim nos ab ubertate Domûs suæ, et torrente deliciarum suarum corda nostra rigabit[i]." Æstus illic non patiemur, illic est enim Refrigerium nostrum, qui sub umbrâ alarum suarum protexit nos et protegit. Frigus illic non patiemur, est enim ibi Sol justitiæ, qui Suo amore calefaciens corda nostra, radiis divinitatis suæ illuminet oculos nostros, ut videant divinitatem et æqualitatem Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Non ibi fatigabimur, nobiscum enim erit Virtus nostra, Cui nunc dicimus, 'Diligam Te Domine virtus mea.' Non ibi dormiemus, non enim ibi sunt tenebræ, quæ excludere possint permanentem Diem, Nulla ibi erit negociatio, nulla servitus, nullum opus, et quid illic acturi sumus? Fortasse illud quod scriptum est 'Vacate et Videte, quoniam ego sum Deus[k].'

[i] Ps. xxxv. [k] Ps. xlviii. S. Aug. Serm. ad Catech. ii. 12.

INDEX.

A.

Acephali, 201.
Action of God, 133.
Adoptianism, 199.
Adumbration of belief in the Trinity, 75.
Æons, 36.
Aetius, 165.
Affusion, 292.
Almighty, 94, 98, 100.
Anabaptists, 295.
Angels, 106.
Antenicene statements of doctrine, 152.
Antioch, Council of, 164, 166.
Apelles, 185.
Apollinaris, 183, 185.
Apostolate, 273, 276.
Apostolicity, 276, 284.
Arians, 128, 156, 186.
Arius, 138.
Artemon, 138.
Ascension, 236.
Assession, 243.
Asterius, 165.
Attributes of God, 41. of the Spirit, 255.

B.

Baptism, 232, 234, 286—298
Basilides, 33, 37, 220.
Bardesanes, 37.
Beatitude, 321, 325.
Beatific Vision, 329.
Benedict VII. 256.
Body of Christ, 275.
Bona, account of the Creed, 7.
Burial of our Lord, 221.

C.

Calvinism, 70, 72.
Cataphrygians, 287.
Catholicity, 283.
Cerdon, 35.
Cerinthus, 138.
Chiersy, Council of, 63.
Christ, 120—123. His death, 216. His suffering, 219.
Church, 271.
Circumcession, 87.
Communicatio idiomatum, 87, note, 143, 208.
Communion of Saints, 273.
Constantine, Emperor, 3.
Constantine Pogonatus, 206.
Constantinople, 315.
Consubstantial, 163—167.
Council of Antioch, 164—166.
Council of Lateran, 206.
Council of Nicæa, 3, 4.
Council of Constantinople, 3, 315. sixth General, 206.
Constantinopolitan Creed, 9.

Creation, 101—108, 168—171.
Cross, the, 211.
Cyril's Anathematisms, 195.

D.

Death of our Lord, theological reasons for, 216.
Deification, 128.
Deipara, 193
Developement of doctrine, 78.
Difficulties of modern science, 108—113.
Διοτυπώσεις, 6.
Divinity of the Son, 136—155. of the Spirit, 252—254.
Docetæ, 183, 221.
Dualism, 32.

E.

Ebion, 138.
Elvira, Council of, 294.
Eternity of punishment, 317.
Eucharist, Holy, 241.
Ever-Virgin, 185.
Evil, moral and physical, 35.
Eudoxius, 168.
Eunomius, 165.
Eusebius, 165. account of the Council, 4.
Eutychianism, 186, 201, 210.

F.

Faith, 13, 14, 15—21.
Father, 94—100.
Freedom of God, 50.

G.

Generation, the Eternal, 130, 135, 153.
Gnosticism, 36, 104, 183.
GOD, 23. metaphysical argument for His existence, 24. natural theological argument, 25. moral argument, 27. His unity, 28, 40. His monarchia, 39. His attributes, 41. The definition of God, 41. His freedom and unchangeableness, 50. His infinity, incomprehensibility, and eternity, 53. His knowledge, 53. His will, 59.
Gotheschalcus, 63.

H.

Heathenism, 30.
Heaven, 317.
Hell, 314.
Holiness of the Church, 286.
Honorius, 206.
Human nature, parts of assumed by Christ, 190. its impeccability, 191.
Hutchinsonians, 91.
Hypostatic union, 187. errors regarding, 191.

I.

Immersion, 291.
Incarnation of the Divine Word. Its motives, 175, 182. errors regarding it, 182. Its definition, 174.

Incomprehensibility of God, 52.
Infinity of God, 52.

J.

Jacobites, 201.
Jansenism, 60, 73.
JESUS, the name of, 118.
John, S. Argument of Gospel, 139.
Judgment, 244.
Justification, 230.
Justinian, Emp. 6.

K.

Kingdom of Christ, 249.
Kingship of Christ, 243.
Knowledge of God, 55.

L.

Light of Glory, 326.
Lifegiver, 286.
Logos, 132.
Lord, The, 115—118.
Lutheranism, 210.

M.

Manichees, 297.
Marcellus of Ancyra, 249.
Marcion, 33.
Marcus, 33.
Martin, 206.
Martyrdom, 296.
MARY, the blessed Virgin, 173, 193, 222.
Messiah, time and epoch of, 118.
Millenarians, 311.
Minister of baptism, 293.
Mission, 135.
Monarchia of God, 39.
Monothelitism, 206.
Mormonite materiality of God, 44.
Mosaic cosmogony, 108.

N.

Natural Theology, 113.
Natures in Christ, 202.
Nestorianism, 186, 192, 194. of the present day, 200.
Nicæa Council, 4.
Nicene Creed, 8.
Notiones, 134.

O.

Ὁμοούσιον, 163—167.
Only-begotten, 124, 129.
Operations in Christ, 208.
Origen, 249.
Ormuzd, 33.
ὅροι, 6.

P.

Pantheism, 44—50.
Part of human nature assumed by the Word, 190.
Patripassianism, 186, 219, 220.
Paul of Samosata, 138.
Paulianists, 138, 287.
Penitence, 289.
Perichoresis, 87.
Phantasiasts, 221.
Philoponus, 92.
Pœna Damni et Sensus, 322.
Polytheism, 30.
Praxeas, 89.

Predestination, 67—72.
Presence of God, 54.
Priesthood of Christ, 23.
Procession, 132. the double, 256.
Properties, 134.
Providence, 68.

Q.

Quiercy, Council of, 68.

R.

Reformers, 288.
Regeneration, 232, 290.
Remission of sin, 287.
Reprobation, 72.
Resurrection of our Lord, 225. of ourselves, 234, 299.
Romans, argument of Epistle to, 74.

S.

Sabellianism, 89, 186.
Salvation of men, 61.
Saturninus, 37.
Sergius III. 256.
S. Silvester, 3.
Simon the Cyrenian, 220.
Simple nature of God, 42.
Simon Magus, 221.
Son of God, 127.
Son, the Creator, 168—171.
Spiration, 132.
SPIRIT, the Holy, 251.
Suffering of our Lord, 216.

T.

Terminology regarding the Blessed Trinity, 22.
Theodotus, 138.
Theotokos, 193.
Trinity, adumbration of belief in, 78. doctrine of, 76. developement of, 78. Scriptural argument, 80—87.
Tritheism, 91.

U.

Ubiquitarians, 210.
Unitarians, 139.
Unity of the Church, 277—280.
Universalists, 315.
Unchangeableness of God, 50.
Union of natures in Christ, 187. vital ditto, 224.
Universal redemption, 60, 64.

V.

Valentinus, 33, 36, 37, 184.
Victor, P. 138.
Vital union in Christ, 224.

W.

Will of God, 59.
Wills in Christ, 207.
Word of God, 124—127, 132.
World, 106.

Z.

Zephyrinus, 138.

1 6 1939